DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 040 SO 019 245

AUTHOR Rutkowski, Edward, Ed.
TITLE Papers and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society (11th, Chicago, Illinois, October 24-25, 1975).
INSTITUTION Midwest History of Education Society, Cedar Falls, IA.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 121p.; For related documents, see SO 019 242-257.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Journal of Midwest History of Education Society; v4 1976

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; Boards of Education; Cultural Pluralism; Dependents; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Governance; Government School Relationship; Immigrants; Junior High Schools; Progressive Education; School Support; Social History; State Schools; Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS Addams (Jane); Dewey (John); Rugg (Harold Ordwell)

ABSTRACT

The proceedings papers include topics on important historical figures, the social and philosophical implications of immigrants and assimilation, the status of women, and the role of education. The two papers in the Editor's Supplement cover the junior high school movement and the establishment of a Michigan state school. "Jane Addams, the Hull House, and the Education of the Immigrants" (M. M. Krug) relates Addams' work to combat exploitation of the immigrants, her ideas on cultural pluralism, and her philosophy of education. "The St. Louis Sparkplug: Henry C. Brokmeyer" (H. B. Dunkel) details Brokmeyer's life, his adoption of Hegelian theories, and his political activities and describes his disciplines. "Centennial Celebration of a Persistent Journal" (R. E. Belding) describes the history of the Journal of Education. "School Governance by Women: The Stepping Stone To Political Participation" (K. H. Kamin) relates women's struggles to gain seats on male-dominated school boards, women's impact on the school systems and teachers, and the effect that these actions had on the movement for universal women suffrage. "Two Treatments of Cultural Difference: Dewey on Nationalism and Kallen on Pluralism" (J. Wissot) reviews John Dewey's views on assimilation and concern about Horace Kallen's position on cultural pluralism. "Harold Rugg: Educator In Search for the Authentic Gesture" (R. V. Bullough, Jr.) describes Rugg's ideas on the condition and destiny of the United States and the nature of an education capable of meeting the U.S. challenge and playing a crucial role in shaping its destiny. "The Junior High School: A Product of Reform Values, 1890-1920" (W. R. Stephens) traces the history of the inception of junior high schools and argues that they are a result of the progressive educational reform movement. "The 'Delicate Duty' of Child Saving: Coldwater, Michigan 1871-1896," (R. S. Patterson; P. Rooke) describes the reform movement to provide state supported educational institutions for the teaching of moral values and physical training to poverty stricken children. The program, the business meeting's minutes, and the attendees list are included. (DJC)

ED298040

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Volume 4, 1976

Contents include

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
EDWARD RUTKOWSKI
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

papers by
Mark M. Krug
Harold B. Dunkel
Robert E. Belding
Kay H. Kamin
Jay Wissot
Robert V. Bullough

together with an
editor's supplement
with papers by
W. Richard Stephens
Robert S. Patterson
and Patricia Rooke

also the program of the Eleventh
Annual Meeting

Published by
College of Education
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls

SO019245

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Volume 4, 1976

Contents include

papers by
Mark M. Krug
Harold B. Dunkel
Robert E. Belding
Kay H. Kamin
Jay Wissot
Robert V. Bullough

together with an
editor's supplement
with papers by
W. Richard Stephens
Robert S. Patterson
and Patricia Rooke

also the program of the Eleventh
Annual Meeting

Published by
College of Education
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls

Distributed and Published for the Society by the

College of Education

University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, Iowa

Copyright 1976 by the Midwest History

of Education Society

Edited by

Edward Rutkowski, University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Any subscription or inquiries should be sent to the
Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society
Education Center, Room 513
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

EDITOR'S FORWARD

This is our eleventh year as a learned society and the fourth year in which we have published a journal as a record of our scholarly pursuits and concerns. Again, we had an excellent meeting with growing attendance. The success of the meeting can be attributed to the astute planning of our program chairman, Rosemary Donatelli, the excellence of the topics, and the demonstrated scholarship of the participants.

This edition of the journal contains all of the papers presented at the meeting. A perusal of the titles of the presentations will reveal their timeliness and educational importance. The papers deal with some important figures of recent American educational history and some significant issues, including the social and philosophical implications of immigration and assimilation, and the status of women and the role of education. Continuing our publishing policy, the editor's supplement in this issue deals with two salient institutional innovations. The first paper is on the junior high school movement by W. Richard Stephens. The second is an accepted paper which was unable to be presented at the fall meeting by Robert S. Patterson and Patricia Rooke. It is on late 19th century reform movements and the establishment of a state school in Michigan for children with social adjustment problems.

Again as always we are indeed grateful to Loyola University for the generous and gracious manner in which they have permitted our society the use of their facilities. Also, the faculty of the College of Education of Loyola University, and especially the Department of Foundations of Education who carry out the important work in putting on our meeting with such excellent dispatch, which has been the catalyst in the growth and success of our endeavors.

Next, to my own institution, the University of Northern Iowa, I wish to extend the gratitude of the society for their permission and use of university facilities in publishing the journal. In particular, I wish to thank the support the staff of the College of Education for their continued help in the improvement in our journal. As editor, I wish to offer a special acknowledgment to Phi Delta Kappa Chapter of the University of Northern Iowa, for their grant to support the journal. Certainly, this is a recognition of our efforts and a reaffirmation to the goals which the Phi Delta Kappa has pledged itself. Finally, to our society which has made publishing the journal a very rewarding experience in my professional life.

Edward Rutkowski
Editor

CONTENTS

PART I

"JANE ADDAMS, THE HULL HOUSE, AND THE EDUCATION OF THE IMMIGRANTS"
by Mark M. Krug, University of Chicago 1

"THE ST. LOUIS SPARKPLUG: HENRY C. BROKMEYER"
by Harold B. Dunkel, University of Chicago 13

"CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF A PERSISTENT JOURNAL"
by Robert E. Belding, University of Iowa 24

"SCHOOL GOVERNANCE BY WOMEN: THE STEPPING STONE TO POLITICAL PARTICIPATION"
by Kay H. Kamin, Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois 35

"TWO TREATMENTS OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCE: DEWEY ON NATIONALISM AND KALLEN ON PLURALISM"
by Jay Wissot, California State College, San Bernardino 49

"HAROLD RUGG: EDUCATOR IN SEARCH FOR THE AUTHENTIC GESTURE"
by Robert V. Bullough, Ohio State University 60

PART II

EDITOR'S SUPPLEMENT

"THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, A PRODUCT OF REFORM VALUES, 1890-1920
by W. Richard Stephens, Greenville College 71

"THE 'DELICATE DUTY' OF CHILD SAVING: COLDWATER, MICHIGAN, 1871-1896"
by Robert S. Patterson and Patricia Rooke, University of Alberta, Edmondton, Canada 94

PART III

PROCEEDINGS

OFFICIAL PROGRAM 111

BUSINESS MEETING AND ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS 113

DIRECTORY OF ATTENDANCE 114

PART I

PAPERS

JANE ADDAMS, THE HULL HOUSE AND THE EDUCATION OF THE IMMIGRANTS

by

Mark M. Krug
Professor of Education in History
University of Chicago

Probably the best laboratory for the study of the process of adjustment, acculturation or assimilation of the immigrants and their children were the Hull House settlement houses in Chicago. And the most competent observer of this process was Jane Addams who founded the Hull House in 1889 at the time when the tidal waves of immigration from Europe to America were already changing the composition of the American society. Hull House served the immigrants, parents, adults and children, as an adult recreation and education center. In the broader sense it was a school or a series of schools for the young. The influence of Jane Addams on public schooling, both by the example of the programs offered at Hull House and through her own efforts, was great and pervasive. Since that phase of Jane Addams' life has been somewhat neglected it is important to see how her views and activities have contributed to the new conceptions of the role of the public schools and education in a society so greatly changed by the great influx of immigrants.

The bibliography on the life and work of Jane Addams is varied and extensive. Several biographies were written by writers and historians and her own works have been republished many times and are still read widely. One question that seems to have fascinated many of those who wrote about Jane Addams concerns an analysis of the motives that caused her to dedicate her long life to Hull House, a complex of settlement houses on Chicago's West Side. The question is important and interesting but the pre-occupation of historians with this issue, seems to have distracted them from a detailed examination of the educational philosophy and the record of Jane Addams in the education of the immigrants and their children. In this generally neglected area in the history of American education, the thoughts and work of the founder of Hull House deserve a great deal of space and attention.

Those who have paid some attention to the contribution of Jane Addams to the acculturation of the immigrants and to the education of their children, seem to have experienced some special difficulty in dealing with the subject. They apparently found it difficult to believe that a rich, WASP, young lady from an upper middle class family, a daughter of a banker, a mill-owner and a State Senator could have learned to understand the plight of the large number of immigrants in the painful process of their adjustment to the American society and the difficulties experienced by their children in their homes, on the streets

and in the public schools. The education of Jane Addams was typical of a well-born young American lady. It culminated in graduation from the Rockford Seminary for Women which proudly called itself the "Mount Holyoke of the West." The curriculum in the seminary included the study of Greek, English literature, moral philosophy, history, some science and a great deal of religious training aimed at preparing many of the ladies to become Christian missionaries.

The home background and the education of Jane Addams caused some writers to suggest that she turned to settlement work in the grimy Chicago neighborhood of Polk and Halsted streets, because she became bored with the life and the activities of her social millieu. One recent biographer wrote that after her graduation from college and after the customary grand tour of Europe, "she did not have a goal or an occupation, or any thing useful to do."[1] This undoubtedly is a true assessment of Addam's predicament just prior to the opening of the Hull House in 1889. It may well be that in the early period of her settlement work, Hull House was for Jane Addams merely a philantropic endeavour. But, in a relatively short period of time, it became a cause to which she happily decided to devote her entire life even to the exclusion of her more personal interests. Why and how did this change take place? Primarly because she learned a great deal about the lives of the many thousands of Italians, Greeks, Jews, Irish, and Bohemians who flocked to the many activities of Hull House and concluded that she could and wanted to be of assistance to them in the realization of their hopes and aspirations. Jane Addams developed a well-thought-out philosophy about the best way to help the large waves of immigrants and their children to adjust to the new and strange American environment. This philosophy was far more perceptive than the simple and often xenophobic notions of "Americanization" which were widely entertained by many of her prominent contemporaries. In the spirit of the time this was no small achievement.

Some writers have failed to perceive the substantial difference between the views on immigration and the immigrants of Jane Addams and those of the other leaders of the Reform and Progressive Movement. For instance she supported and admired Theodore Roosevelt a leading Progressive but she vigorously opposed his extreme views on the Americanization of the immigrants. She also does not fit very well in the general interpretation of the motives of the Progressive leaders who in the view of one of the most brilliant historians of the period, Richard Hofstadster, were members of the socially alienated groups who turned to reform out of a sense of guilt because they lived in comparative luxury in the midst of the squalor of the cities. It seemed natural to put Jane Addams in that group. She was alienated from her social millieu and she was rich and bored. Christopher Lasch, correctly pointed out that Jane Addams at the time of the founding of the Hull House did not feel guilty about the sorry lot of the workers and the poor who were victims of industralism. In Lasch's view, at that period of her life, she was rebelling against her family, and especially

against her mother who wanted her to lead a life of leisure as befitted her station in life. She did not feel, Lasch added that she was making a sacrifice by helping the poor and the immigrants and she did not have a condescending attitude toward them but was dedicated to "bridging the chasm that industrialism has opened between social classes."[2] But American people made Jane Addams a saint, Lasch concluded, and she became a national myth and the myth of Jane Addams served to render her harmless as a social critic.

In the New Radicalism in America, Lasch is even more skeptical about the effectiveness of Jane Addams as a social worker and reformer. "The trouble," he writes, "was that Jane Addams was asking, in effect, that young people be adjusted to a social order which by her own admission was cynically indifferent to their welfare."[3] The American industrial society was in the eyes of Jane Addams, guilty of oppressing and repressing the workers who served it, but according to Lasch she made no attempt to change the system. Her only aim was to make it function more smoothly. In fact, Lasch maintains, that the educational efforts of the head of Hull House were aimed at fostering the ideal of "social control" so well articulated by her friend John Dewey.[4] Paul Violas, sees Jane Addams' view of the immigrants as paternalistic and her reforms, not as liberal or enlightening but conservative or even reactionary. Her entire life's work was dedicated, say Violas, to "an attempt to replace the social control implict in the village community in the countries of origin of the immigrant Italians, Greeks and others with the controls more suitable to an urban environment."[5] Violas charges that Jane Addams'," system of beliefs was based not on dedication to individual freedom but on an advocacy of an organic society acting as a collective association."[6] Ignoring a great' deal what Jane Addams has written and done to combat the feeling of alienation and boredom on the part of individual workers, Violas insists that Jane Addams saw individualism as a plague in the American urbanized and industralized society. This, he says, was a repressive philosophy aimed at keeping the workers from demanding medical changes and improvements in the American society.

Quoting single words like "primitive," "illiterate," "clannish," "single," and others, Violas concludes that she had contempt for the immigrants. "The immigrant, for Jane Addams, presented a threat," Violas writes, "because her different ethnic background disrupted American cultural unity. The relative ease, however, with which he could be stripped of his cultural foundations and reduced to the simplest elements of humanity enhanced his value as a building block for her new community."[7] Violas also charges Jane Addams with using the Hull House to engage in a propaganda scheme, employing effective devices of mass psychology with the purpose of defusing social conflicts." "Throughout her discussions of the recreational activities at Hull House," Violas writes, "one finds rationale for social control through the manipulation of subconscious and non-rational impulses."[8] Michael Katz, in a thoughtful review of Roots of Crisis, took issue with Violas' contention. "Violas also suggests, "Katz stated," that her

insistence on the importance of popularizing ideas indicates she believed in the legitimacy and necessity of propaganda. But his quotations from her writings do not show anything of the sort."[9]

What Katz said about the absence of evidence to support the contention about Addams' views on manipulation of public opinion, applies equally to Violas conclusions about her views on the immigrants and on the education of their children. His is not a fair analysis of her attitude to the immigrants and of her philosophy about the process of acculturation of the immigrants to the American society. It also seems that Violas knows little about the educational and recreational activities in the Hull House. While Christopher Lasch's essays on Jane Addams are perceptive and innovative, his conclusion that Jane Addams was a supporter of the social status quo, is in the light of her record and writings off the mark. The Mayor of Chicago, the political bosses of the city, industrialists like George Pullman, would have been astonished to read that the head of Hull House, was a "harmless social critic." The Mayor would have, among other things, related the trouble Jane Addams caused him on the issue of garbage collection on the West Side of Chicago and how the garbage was collected after she was appointed Garbage Commissioner of her ward. In Chicago of those days, this was no small achievement.

At the time of the founding of the Hull House, America was already a Nation of Immigrants. Newcomers from Southern and Eastern Europe were pouring into the country often at a rate of 40,000 per day. The 1890 Census disclosed that 20 million Americans were either foreign by birth or parentage, while 34,000,000 were classed as native white Americans. James Bryce expressed the apprehension of many leading Americans when he wrote in 1888 in The American Commonwealth; "Within the last decade new swarms of European immigrants have invaded America, drawn from their homes in the eastern part of Central Europe. There seems to be a danger that if they continue to come in large number they may retain their low standards of decency and comfort, and menace the continuance among the working class generally of that far higher standard which has hitherto prevailed in all but a few spots in the country."[10]

Josiah Strong echoed Bryce's sentiments and wrote in The Twentieth Century City that while America was indebted to the immigrants "for developing its resources we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the foreign population, as a whole, is depressing our average in intelligence and morality in the direction of the deadline of crime and ignorance."[11]

Leaders in American society, writers, editors and thinkers and many influential members of Congress shared the convictions of Bryce and Strong that the immigrants had lower morals, were by far not as smart as the native Americans, had a predisposition to crime and to living in unsanitary conditions and thus could easily adversely influence, if not contaminate the superior native American population.

Jane Addams rejected these ideas about the immigrants. Unlike Bryce, Cubberley, Strong and others, she had direct contact with the immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe. In fact, she lived among them and with them and soon developed an affection and respect for them. In her autobiography she described the area around the Hull House. "Between Halstead Street and the river lived about ten thousand Italians -- Neapolitans, Sicilians, and Calabrians, with an occasional Lombard and Venetian. To the South on Twelfth Street are many Germans, and side streets are given almost entirely to Polish and Russian Jews. Still farther south, these Jewish colonies merge into a huge Bohemian colony, so vast that Chicago ranks as the third Bohemian city in the world. To the northwest are many Canadian-French, clannish in spite of their long residence in America, and to the north are Irish and first generation of Americans."[12]

Jane Addams made great efforts to learn as much as she could about the various groups of the immigrants. She met them daily in the classrooms, in the cafeteria and in the many meeting halls in the Hull House buildings. She was an able and a thorough student and in a relatively short period of time she came to a number of conclusions about her clients. She firmly rejected the attitude of superiority and contempt toward the immigrants. Her heart was overflowing with sympathy for the hardships and the sufferings of the newcomers, mostly peasants, who were suddenly and often savagely exposed to the ruthlessness of the American industrial system. She deplored the working conditions in the sweatshops, the lack of minimum safety precautions and the rampart exploitation in the huge textile factory of Schaffner and Marx which was located on Chicago's west side. Jane Addams was particularly appalled by the practice of "outside piece work," an arrangement by which contractors let families work at home on cutting and sewing of pants, suits and dresses and were paid by the number of finished garments. To eke out a meager living, some families, including small children often worked sixteen hours per day.[13]

But the founder of Hull House did not intend to merely stand by and wring her hands at the sorry lot of the immigrants. She developed a two-fold program of action to combat the exploitation and the deplorable conditions she witnessed. First came the opening of the Hull House to various groups in which heated debates about the grievances and the rights of workers were discussed. One such club, "The Working Peoples' Social Science Club" was often attacked by leading businessmen, including supporters of Hull House, as promoting radical ideas. Jane Addams responded by declaring that her settlement house maintained an open door policy to all ideas. "I did not intend," she said, "to be subsidized by millionaires and neither did I propose to be bullied by working men."[14] When the Pullman Strike came, Jane Addams was critical of the division of the Chicago community along class lines. In a paper which she published on the strike entitled "The Modern King Lear," Addams, maintained that George Pullman, the modern King Lear, bore the major blame for the strike because he

expected the gratitude of the workers in exchange for this paternalistic effort to organize their lives in the Pullman community. Pullman, she wrote gave the workers "sanitary houses and beautiful parks" but made no effort to find out their desires, and without any organization through which to give them social expansion." He wanted his workers to live in decency and thrift, Jane Addams wrote but he deprived them of their right to order their own lives.[15]

Another major effort of Jane Addams was directed to the allieviation of the exploitation of the immigrants. She was successful in influencing the State legislature to pass the first factory law in Illinois which provided for sanitary conditions in the sweatshops and set the minimum age for the employment of children at 14.[16] Disagreeing with the advocates of "Americanization," Jane Addams, repeatedly protested the hostility that so many native Americans exhibited toward the immigrants. Recognizing that the immigrants had a rich cultural heritage and religious and literary values which were worth preserving, she was opposed to the pressure exerted by the public schools and the dominant society on the children of the immigrants to repudiate the culture of their parents. "We were often distressed," she recalled, "by the children of immigrant parents who were ashamed of the pit whence they were digged, who repudiated the language and the customs of their elders, and considered themselves successful as they were able to ignore the past."[17] Unlike the leaders of the nativist, xenophobic movement, Jane Addams wanted the Jews, the Poles, the Italians, the Bohemians, and other ethnic minorities, to preserve their cultural mores while adjusting to the new life in America.[18] Assimilation for the Italians and Bohemians, Jane Addams observed, often meant disdain for their cultures and the worship of American materialism.[19] To encourage respect for the native cultures of immigrants, the management of Hull House frequently arranged for handicraft and art exhibits and dance and musical festivals in which each immigrant group participated. To the delight of the Italians, Hull House regularly arranged for mass meetings in honor of Garibaldi and Mazzini. Greeks had their Hellenic meetings and festivals and Jewish intellectuals debated, Jewish history, Zionism and Socialism.

Jane Addams, as we mentioned, insisted that her staff members work directly in the homes of the immigrants, often doing menial chores but primarly learning their values, customs and mode of life. She hoped that the outcome would be mutual respect. "The number of people," she wrote "thus informed is constantly increasing in our American cities, and they may in time remove the reproach of social neglect and indifference which has so long rested upon the citizens of the new world."[20]

Addams did not want to "Anglo-Saxonize" or Americanize the immigrants. On the contrary, long before sociologists like Horace Kallen coined the phrase, she embraced "cultural pluralism" as the desired basic concept pertaining to the American society. In this, as in many other of her ideas on social issues and education, she was far

ahead of her times. Her insight into the need to acculturate but not to assimilate the immigrants was remarkable. There were many classes at Hull House where immigrants were taught English to prepare them to take the required examination on the U.S. Constitution, in order to become citizens. There were also many courses on United States History and government. These courses and lectures were designed to help the immigrants to understand and to adjust to their new country but, at the same time, to better understand and appreciate their own cultures. But they were not the usual "Americanization" classes. "The aim of all the classes," Jane Addams observed, "was not to set the immigrants apart from their groups as "Americans" . . . . On the contrary the aim was to connect him (the immigrant) with all sorts of people by his ability to understand them as well as by his power to supplement their present surrounding with historic background . . . . In these classes the immigrants have struggled to express in their new acquired tongue some of these hopes and longings which had so much to do with their immigration.[21]

Violas and other revisionist historians of education who have suggested that Jane Addams shared in the general hostility toward the immigrants and charged that she manipulated them in order to defuse social conflicts, would do well to go back and examine, with greater care, what she actually did and wrote in the several decades of her Hull House activity.

Far from being a tool of the abrasive and aggressive business establishment of Chicago on whose financial support she depended, Jane Addams came to the defense of the rights of the immigrant workers the founding of the Immigrant Protection League. When business owners began to harass peddlers by having vagrant youth attack them, Jane Addams organized several ethnic Peddlers Associations to impress upon the city and the police that they had the obligation to protect the Jewish, Italian and Greek peddlers. Jane Addams insisted, in spite of a barrage of attacks from the press and the business community, that Hull House practices freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. The ten thousand people who each week availed themselves of the clubroom, the Labor Museum, school rooms, Women's Clubs buildings, boys' buildings, gymnasium, the music school and the lecture halls,[22] heard speakers who were conservative, and liberal university professors, radical union organizers, representatives of business and manufacturing interests, Socialists, Bundists, Zionists, Italian and Czech nationalists and occasionally even advocates of non-violent anarchism. Answering the critics who charged that she was turning her settlement into a hotbed of radicalism, Jane Addams replied that she hoped that the demonstration of how Hull House practiced the American ideals of freedom would increase the confidence of the immigrants in the American institutions and government.[23] Her credo was simple:

"The settlement recognizes the need of cooperation both with the radical and the conservative and from the very nature of the case, the Settlement cannot limit its friends to any political party or economic school."[24]

To question the patriotism of the immigrants, to accuse them of "double loyalty" of harboring subversives and anarchists was a fashionable thing to do in the period of great immigration. These accusations came from the press, the Congress, local, state and federal law enforcement officials and from most of the patriotic organizations. Jane Addams never joined this super-patriotic xenophobic hysteria. Instead, courageously and at great personal sacrifice, she stated on many occasions that her direct experience with the many thousands of immigrants convinced her that the immigrants, with few exceptions, "adored America." She called for restraint and fairness by the police, the courts and the public in dealing with suspected anarchists.[25]

Jane Addams faced the greatest challenge on this issue during the period of the "Red Scare" in the 1920's following the success of the Bolshevik Revolution. Herself under attack by the press, by the D.A.R. and the American Legion for not being "100% American," because of her advocacy of pacificism and internationalism, Jane Addams repeatedly condemned the wholesale arrests of leaders of various radical immigrant groups and associations and the suppression of hundreds of foreign language periodicals on unproved charges of subversion.[26] She regretted the "spirit of intolerance which had spread over our time choking free sensibilities" and expressed concern that these excesses would further alienate the immigrants from American society. "There is no doubt," she wrote in her second volume of her autobiography, "that the immigrant population in the United States suffered from a sense of ostracism after the war, which in spite, of many difficulties, sorrows and despairs, they had never before encountered, in such a universal fashion."[27] In spite of the overwhelming cry in the press and in Congress to limit immigration for Central and Southern Europe, Jane Addams opposed the "quota laws."[28] Jane Addams truly believed in the theory which constituted an amalgamation of the concepts of the Melting Pot and Cultural Pluralism and was convinced that American democracy was not endangered by the tremendous influx of non-Nordic immigrants. On the contrary she firmly believed that America would emerge richer and stronger because of the infusion of the skills and talents brought by newcomers and because of its ability to make use of these contributions of the various immigrant groups.

She spoke and wrote in defense of the immigrants and maintained that if some immigrants had a feeling of hostility to America, it was a response to the animosity they encountered and to the brazen attempts of some Americanizers to depreciate their heritage. "Is the Universe friendly?" said Jane Addams, "is a question that people ask, but this question never presses so hard upon the bewildered human creature as it does upon a stranger in a strange land when his very mother tongue,

his inherited customs and moves, his clothing, his food, are all subjected to ridicule and considered per se un-American, if not indeed dangerous and subversive of American institutions."[29]

Slowly the feeling of sympathy for the immigrants became mingled in Jane Addams' mind with a sense of appreciation for their ability to rise rapidly in a basically hostile environment. She noted the many young Jews, Bohemians and Greeks did well in colleges and became doctors, lawyers and successful businessmen. Jane Addams was an outspoken supporter and admirer of Sidney Hillman the leader of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America who in 1915 settled a strike in the largest clothing factory in Chicago by a pact which provided for a high degree of cooperation between the employers and the employees. Hillman stated publicly that the union was interested in the company making good profits because the workers would benefit from its prosperity. Jane Addams to whom the ideal of industrial and social peace was very dear, commented: "perhaps this great industrial experiment in Chicago founded upon an agreement between the workers and the employers, was easier to bring about among immigrants than it would have been among native born."[30]

Jane Addams developed a comprehensive philosophy of education with particular reference to the role of the public schools in the education of the children of the immigrants. She had need for such a philosophy because Hull House was a huge educational institution serving thousands of adults, teenagers and children in clubs and formal classes. Throughout her life, Jane Addams was interested in public education and in 1905 became a member of the Chicago Board of Education.

She set down her views on education and on schooling in her largely overlooked book, Democracy and Social Ethics, which came out in 1902, eight years before the publication of her famous autobiography. In her philosophy of education, Jane Addams was influenced by her friend and co-worker John Dewey but much of her educational thinking was original and unlike Dewey, who hardly recognized the problem of education of hundreds of thousands of children of immigrants, Miss Addams was keenly aware of this complex dilemma. In her views on democracy, Jane Addams shared the pragmatic outlook of Dewey and of her other dear friend, Henry James. She believed that the real test of a successful democracy is not its creed of the freedom, dignity and equality of men but the extent to which it allows all its citizens to live in freedom, dignity and equality.[31] American society must be educated to the ideal of "industrial amelioration," or a peaceful co-existence of the workers and the owners of industry. Such an amelioration can only come by a spirit of cooperation among the workers, industry, society and the government.[32]

Accepting Dewey's position, Jane Addams postulated that the aim of schooling was to free the innate powers and abilities of each child and "connect him" with the rest of life. The pupil must be helped to

see his productive place in the society. She was impatient with purely cognitive objectives of school curricula. "We are impatient," she wrote, "with the schools which lay all stress on reading and writing, suspecting them to rest upon the assumption that the ordinary experience of life is worth little and that all knowledge and interest must be brought to the children through the medium of books."[33] Citing the example of the Italian colony in the Hull House neighborhood, Jane Addams observed that Italian parents take their children, especially boys out of school at the age of thirteen or fourteen and that these children exposed to "bookish" education were not prepared for the harsh reality of life as factory workers or apprentices. She noted that for these Italian children, the family and the street constituted a far greater influence then did the public schools. They learned at home and on the street skills and values, which they needed to survive in a hostile society. Italian children had little motivation for learning and they often shared the doubts of their parents whether schooling was a road to economic success. They knew that those in their community who became affluent had hardly any education.[34] To remedy this situation, Jane Addams demanded that public schools which had a large proportion of children of immigrants, cease to belittle their ethnic heritage and values and devote a great part of their curricula to teaching the meaning and the process of production. Thus, she hoped, these future workers would understand the meaning of their work and see its worth and significance for themselves and for the society.[35] Children of the immigrants who were destined to go into specialized, often dull, jobs, would be helped if the schools teach them where their jobs fit and how important they were in the total operation of the factory or the shop. If the shop constantly tends, "Addams wrote," to make the working man a specialist, then the problem of the educator is clear: it is to give him what may be an offset from over-specialization of his daily work, to supply him with general information and to insist he shall be a cultivated member of society with a consciousness of his industrial and social value."[36]

This may have been a naive approach because it assumed that the worker was interested in learning about the total operation of his factory and that that knowledge would have helped him to bear the hardships caused by low pay and bad working conditions. But combatting the boredom of the workers on the assembly lines, is still the preoccupation of many unions and employers today. In that area too, Jane Addams was ahead of her time.

Her contemporaries have made Jane Addams, as Christopher Lasch, has observed a saint and a national myth. The record seems to indicate that they were right on both counts.

NOTES

[1] Allen F. Davis, *American Heroine-The Life and Legend of Jane Addams*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1973, p. 40.

[2] Christopher Lasch, editor, *The Social Thought of Jane Addams*, Bobbs Merrill Co., Indianapolis, 1965, Introduction, XIV.

[3] Christopher Lasch, *The New Radicalism in America*, 1889-1963, New York, Vintage Books, 1967, p. 157.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Paul Violas *"Jane Addams and the New Liberalism"* in *Roots of Crisis by Clarence J. Karier, Paul Violas and Joel Spring, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1973, p. 70.*

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[7] Violas, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[8] Violas, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

[9] Michael Katz "Review of Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century" by Clarence J. Karier, Paul Violas, Joel Spring, (Chicago, Rand McNally, 1973) in *Harvard Educational Review*, V 43, No. 3, August 1973, p. 438.

[10] Quoted from, *City Life, 1865-1900, Views of Urban America* Ann Cook, Marilyn Grittell and Herb Mack, Editors, Praeger Publishers, N.Y., 1973, p. 6.

[11] Quoted from, *City Life*, op. cit, p. 67.

[12] Jane Addams *Twenty Years* of Hull House, New York, Macmillan Co., 1938, p. 99.

[13] *Twenty Years, op. cit.*, p. 100.

[14] *Twenty Years, op. cit.*, p. 185.

[15] Jane Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1902, p. 146.

[16] *Twenty Years, op. cit.*, p. 201.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

[19] *Twenty Years, op. cit.*, p. 36.

[20] *Twenty Years, op. cit.*, p. 366.

[21] *Twenty Years, op. cit.*, p. 436.

[22] List of activities and building taken from Hull House – 1889-1909 Booklet published by the Hull House Association, Chicago, 1901, p. 4.

[23] *Twenty Years, op. cit.*, p. 412.

[24] *Twenty Years, op. cit.*, p. 412.

[25] Jane Addams, *The Second Twenty Years at Hull House*, the MacMillan Company, New York, 1930, p. 188.

[26] Jane Addams, *The Second Twenty Years at Hull House*, the MacMillan Company, New York, 1930, p. 188.

[27] Second Twenty Years, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

[29] The Second Twenty Years, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

[30] The Second Twenty Years, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

[31] *Jane Addams, Democracy and Social Ethics*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1964 edition.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[33] Democracy and Social Ethics, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

[34] Democracy and Social Ethics, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 219.

[36] Democracy and Social Ethics, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

THE ST. LOUIS SPARKPLUG: HENRY C. BROKMEYER

Harold B. Dunkel
University of Chicago

Mention of the St. Louis Philosophical Society or of the St. Louis Hegelians tends to bring to the minds of educational historians various names. That most likely to occur is William Torrey Harris, the most conspicuous of the American Hegelians. Or perhaps Denton J. Snider is recalled, whose History of the St. Louis Movement and autobiography, A Writer of Books in his Genesis, are important source materials regarding the movement and the period. Then there are the females: Anna Brackett, the translator of Rosenkranz's Padagogik als System, and Susan Blow, the protagonist of Froebel and the kindergarten with some Hegelian coloring. All these have their place in educational history and are probably the names most likely to come to mind.

Probably less likely to rise above the threshold of consciousness, however, is the name or very much information about the intellectual father, mainspring, or sparkplug of the whole movement, the subject of this paper, Henry Brokmeyer. The name will occur to some of you, but probably very few sentences could contain all you remember about him beyond the fact that he did stimulate Harris, Snider, and the other members of the St. Louis group.

At first thought, this fact may seem something of an anomoly. The disciples became famous and are still remembered to some extent; but the master has fallen into what is almost oblivion. But historians and biographers who might have kept Brokmeyer's fame alive have had to face what seems to be a sad fact. Such people like to write true accounts, and it seems unlikely that a true account of Brokmeyer's life and influence is possible. The biographical waters are too hopelessly muddied. Only a rash fisherman like your present speaker would choose to cast his line into such a murky pond.

Brokmeyer himself was the first to stir in silt. He spelled both Brock- and -meyer in every conceivable fashion and combination. Personally I don't worry much about this since my own name has historically been spelled in equally diverse ways. In the case of the Dunkels, however, I feel sure that most of my ancestors spelled it with an x and that the orthographic ingenuity is attributable to the various Lutheran preachers, town clerks and other literates who added "Jacob Dunkel, his mark," spelling Dunkel as they thought best. Brokmeyer, however, created the chaos all by himself. He also kept changing the date of his birth. This shifting was not an effort to cast a youthful image or to deceive the Grim Reaper since he continually ran the years up and down like a yo-yo for no apparent reason. But these are minor obfuscations contributed by Brokmeyer.

More important, a posthumanous volume published by his son, A Mechanic's Diary, purports to be Brokmeyer's journal for approximately the first year after he arrived in St. Louis (May 1 to Nov. 8, 1856). Since this book is full of interesting details and lively anecdotes, the biographer or historian at first encounter tends to seize on it hopefully. But a closer look discloses many disquieting facts. The first entry, giving a brief sketch of events prior to his arrival, contradicts all such little other evidence as is available, including various accounts by Brokmeyer himself. The very last entry records his marriage to his first wife, an event that actually took place five years later. The middle section portrays him as a major figure in the development of an important German settlement in southern Illinois, directly across the river from St. Louis; unfortunately the rest of the historical record shows clearly that he had absolutely nothing to do with these developments. In short, the Diary is a work of fiction. In part it enabled Brokmeyer to paint himself the way he would have liked to be seen. In part it was a peg on which he could hang long discussions of Philosophy, Life, Work, Woodcraft, and assorted other topics.

Brokmeyer's friends and admirers also complicated matters. He was the sort of man to generate legends and apocryphal stories. Sometimes narrators pass on their tale with the open acknowledgement that the account is not literally true. Their justification usually is that the fiction portrays the demonic character and thrust of the man more accurately than the bare facts ever could. For example, J. Gabriel Woerner, a St. Louis lawyer of the period, known for his Hegel-based texts on guardianship and on the administration of estates, also wrote a roman a clef, The Rebel's Daughter, dealing with St. Louis in the period following the Civil War. According to Woerner's son William, the character Rauenfels in that novel is the most accurate portrayal of Brokmeyer in existence; still as a blend of unlabeled and undistinguishable fact and fiction, that picture hardly constitutes reliable source material for the sober historian, or even a drunken one. But the present account would, however, admittedly be more sparkling had my scholarly conscience allowed me to adorn my tale with these attractive fictions.

Heinrich Konrad Brokmeyer was born in Minden in Hanover in (shall we say) 1826 (though you can jiggle the date a couple of years either way if you like) and migrated to America in 1843 (or thereabouts), part of the wave of Germans then fleeing political reaction or seeking economic betterment. As tradition demands of all such newcomers, he arrived with three words of English and twenty-five cents in his pocket. (If he learned those words from sailors on the ship, what they were is not beyond historical conjecture.) He seems to have apprenticed himself to a tanner and currier in New Jersey. Then at the completion of his apprenticeship, he wandered south, possibly acquiring a number of other trades in the course of his travels. As many as a half-dozen more are mentioned in various places, and the tally may well be correct, for he was bright, clever with his hands and a hard worker. There is

unanimous agreement that he was a skilled woodsman, well able to live off the fish and game of the land. Eventually in Mississippi he put down roots. He opened a tannery and shoe-factory and, since German Lutheran congregations were in short supply there, joined the Baptist church.

Although the enterprise prospered, Brokmeyer sold it after a few years (how many is not certain) for what was apparently a rather handsome sum--or so Brokmeyer said. Partly, it seems, he did not like the climate, and partly he wished to extend his formal education. So he sought out Baptist institutions of higher learning, Georgetown College in Kentucky and Brown University in Rhode Island. He was summarily expelled from both of them by their presidents. These worthies, as was traditional at the time, were divines and taught the courses in moral philosophy and religion. Brokmeyer, who was, even then, no docile learner or dependent thinker, entered into heated controversy with them on matters of dogma and was promptly ejected before he could infect the rest of the student body with his skepticism and doubt. Here ended his formal education, and we don't know actually how much of it there was. But he had found the load-star of all the rest of his life and thought. He had found Hegel. He acquired not merely a life-long devotion to Hegelian doctrine but also a missionary zeal to preach it to those with whom he came in contact.

George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel was, as you all know, the foremost philosopher in the first four decades of the 19th century when his doctrine was essentially the official philosophy of Prussia. His ideas spread through Europe and infiltrated many of the intellectual fields, notably history, theology, and art history in addition to philosophy. Even after its popularity declined, it passed into assorted Neo-Hegelianisms, of which that of Karl Marx is the most familiar.

In America, however, as late as the middle of the 19th century, Hegel was little known outside a small circle of German-speaking intellectuals. Essentially without exception the few American theologians and philosophers who did refer to him or commented on him were either hostile or incompetent--and usually they managed to be both simultaneously.

D. F. Hedge, then the Unitarian minister in Providence, was one of the few transcendentalists with a thorough knowledge of German philosophy; and when he prepared a general literary anthology, Prose Writers of Germany, he naturally included Hegel. He entrusted the Hegel translation and commentary to a friend, Henry Boyston Smith. Since Smith was a Congregational minister, one might have expected the usual theological bias. But in the preface to the book Hedge attributed Smith's contribution merely to an anonymous "friend" and hence Smith had no ministerial role thrust upon him, especially in what was simply a literary anthology of German prose of all sorts. Besides Smith had studied at the University of Berlin when Hegelianism was at its height; and I suspect that this experience, in addition to providing

him with an adequate knowledge of Hegel, gave him some feeling for disinterested scholarship. At any rate, we may be thankful that Smith did a competent translation and made his introductions exegetical rather than polemical.

This is the book which Brokmeyer seems to have discovered in a bookstore in Providence, and it hooked him on Hegel for life. Having then also acquired, apparently, some single volumes of Hegel in the German edition of the collected works, he set out for the western wilderness. In Hegelian terms, he felt that he had been too long in "civil society" and that it was time for another of those solitary wanderings through the wilderness which are a recurrent theme of in his life. This time he moved southwest, and in 1852 he arrived in Webster County, Missouri. There he built himself a shack and supported himself by rod and gun in a primitive existence that makes Thoreau's sojourn at Walden Pond seem like a veritable Sunday-School picnic. The rest of his time he devoted to study, especially to translating into English Hegel's Science of Logic, the book usually regarded as the key to the system.

About this time the banking firm with whom he had deposited his nest-egg gained from the sale of his factory failed. His loss, $27,500--if any credence can be given to Brokmeyer's statement in his Mechanic's Diary--was a rather tidy sum considering the purchasing power of the pre-Civil-War dollar. To be reduced to the same penurious state in which he had first landed on these shores was particularly grievous because Brokmeyer had decided he wanted to buy a farm. Not only would it provide for his old age; it would better occupy him with manual labor for those hours when he was too tired to think and study than did his present quasi-nomadic mode of life. To recoup his fortune for this purpose, he moved into St. Louis and took a job in a stove factory. According to the Diary he undertook to learn still another new trade, iron molding, because he found out it was the best-paid in the city.

From this point on, I can substantiate any specific dates I use in my narrative, for there are sufficient cross-checks to satisfy any historian. But, as we shall see, some few matters still draft vaguely in the chronology.

At that time, St. Louis, like many of the cities and towns of America, was beginning to be populated by many small, informal groups bent on culture, self-improvement or civic betterment. One Sunday evening in 1858 Brokmeyer, with his usual interest in the intellectual life, dropped in on a meeting of one such "philosophical society" in the St. Louis Merchantile Library. This was apparently a rather wild-eyed group, with "philosophy" interpreted to include theosophy, phrenology, graphology, astrology, Oriental mysticism, and the like. Among these devotees of pseudo-science, only one man seemed to Brokmeyer to be not only sane but intelligent. That was the secretary, one William Torrey Harris.

There are several versions of how Brokmeyer sought out Harris after the meeting and how, beginning in a night-long conversation then, Brokmeyer won Harris to Hegel. Some of these accounts have all the drama of the conversion of St. Paul on the road to Damascus, losing nothing in the telling and retelling over the years. Whatever the true facts of that incident, Brokmeyer convinced Harris that he was wasting his time on phrenology and the like only because he despaired of knowing the truth, but that Hegel could lead him to the truth. Harris was probably easily persuaded because he himself realized that his devotion to what he called his "little isms" was only part of his youthful revolt against everything that his family, society and Yale had tried to teach him. After this first meeting Harris never turned back but spent the rest of his life as a devoted Hegelian.

The upshot of this meeting was the eventual formation of the St. Louis Philosophical Society. In it Brokmeyer was the original intellectual sparkplug; Harris, the recruiter and administrator. The present is not the place to rehearse the history of the St. Louis Hegelian movement, but a bit must be said about it. For despite Brokmeyer's subsequent political career, such place as he may hold in history should probably rest on his role in enlightening and enlivening the group of young men who formed the St. Louis Philosophical Society, as well as a group of young ladies, such as Anna Brackett and Susan Blow, who, though not strictly members of the Society, were closely associated with the members and their undertakings. Infecting them with his enthusiasm for Hegelianism, Brokmeyer's influence spread anonymously beyond this relatively small circle through their books, speeches and activities. And partly because of this anonymity, his Hegelian contribution to both schooling and to education in its wider sense, has tended to be lost to view.

Harris, at the time of first meeting Brokmeyer, was a young teacher in the St. Louis schools, just beginning his meteoric rise to the superintendency of them. In that latter position he made both the St. Louis schools and himself famous and did much to elevate the school superintendency to that position it enjoyed for the next 100 years until recent struggles have made the position more ulcerous than glamorous. He then moved to New England to establish the Concord School of Philosophy with Emerson and Bronson Alcott. Next he became U.S. Commissioner of Education. As one of his rivals G. Stanley Hall put it, during the last quarter of the 19th century W. T. Harris ruled U.S. education "with papal authority." A Yale drop-out who never achieved any earned degree, he acquired a truly impressive string of honorary LL.D's and Ph.D.'s from American and German universities.

Denton Snider, who fell most completely under Brokmeyer's spell, published forty-some books on a wide variety of subjects, many of them on an Hegelian base. This out-put includes five volumes presenting a new psychological theory based on Hegel, which at least one historian

of psychology considers unjustly neglected in recent years. He also devoted much energy to establishing "peoples' universities," study clubs and lecture series in many Midwestern cities. For example, he offered a very popular one annually at the Art Institute of Chicago during the Christmas holidays until the program was moved to Elizabeth Harrison's Chicago Kindergarten College when he became a professor there.

George Howison fell under the spell despite himself. He had come to St. Louis to teach in Washington University, went on to become chairman of the Department of Philosophy at the University of California, trained a long series of professional philosophers, and developed his own variant of a somewhat Hegelian idealism still noted in the histories of philosophy.

Anna C. Brackett, who was principal of the St. Louis normal school--the first female to hold such a post in America--also fell for a time into the Hegelian stream. She translated the major Hegelian educational work, Karl Rosenkranz's Pedagogy as a System, which continued as a basic text in some normal schools for several decades and survived even longer as a standard authority to cite and as a model to imitate for American authors writing their own books on education.

Two young men, Samuel Emory, Sr. and Edward McClure, from Quincy, Illinois, which was then something of a hot-bed of culture, heard about Brokmeyer's translation and hired a young lady to make a manuscript copy. This they took with them when they went to Harvard to continue their educations, and they dragooned William James into working through it with them one year. James, as we know from his diary, dragged his feet all the way, making disparaging remarks about men of only one book. But his two students forced him to persist. Hence, if we are willing to stretch a few points, we can say that Brokmeyer, at long distance and second-hand, taught Hegel even to Harvard's most distinguished philosopher and psychologist.

Finally, to terminate this very abbreviated account of the intellectual activity Brokmeyer stirred up, in 1867 Harris founded the Journal of Speculative Philosophy, editing and publishing it until 1893. The first purely philosophic journal in America, it afforded an outlet not merely for the numerous papers and translations of the St. Louis group, but also enabled rising young philosophers like Charles Pierce and John Dewey to get a hearing in a journal of international circulation.

At the early meetings of the Society the main order of business was to work through a few pages of the Logic in Brokmeyer's translation though many of the members could probably have handled the German original. In fact, Snider asserts that he often had to consult the German original in order to understand the translation. Brokmeyer led the discussion and usually did the interpretation. As a result, over the weeks, months and years his satellites were also drawn into the

magnetic field of Hegel.

Numerous witnesses testify how Brokmeyer became transfigured when he entered intellectual discussions. The sodden-appearing laborer in work clothes dirty from the foundry was immediately transformed into the combatative disputant with sharp tongue and flashing eyes. His close familiarity with the texts of many major philosophers in addition to Hegel made him a formidable adversary. If the Diary is to be trusted, his habit was, the first thing in the morning, to read and reread a few pages of Aristotle, Kant, or whichever other philosopher he was working on at the time. If there were passages he did not understand, he tried to memorize them. Then as he worked in the factory during the rest of the day, he kept turning these sentences over in his mind--"putting them to soak" as he called it; and he usually felt that by the end of the day he had overcome the difficulty, to his own satisfaction at least. Whatever the merit of the interpretations he finally achieved, certainly this procedure gave him a detailed knowledge of many major philosophic works.

He enjoyed intellectual confrontations. Thus when Emerson came on lecture tour from the effete East to cast a few pearls of culture before the barbarians dwelling in partibus infidelium (or in St. Louis to be exact), Brokmeyer insulted him by chewing him up with an Hegelian dialectic; and only the frowning looks of Brokmeyer's friends kept him from perpetrating similar massacres upon Bronson Alcott, who was an even more frequent visitor. To a man whose mind had been honed on Aristotle, Kant, Hegel and the like, the hazy intuitions and intimations of the transcendentalists seemed like the merest vaporings, and Brokmeyer was not one to suffer them quietly.

With Brokmeyer's translation completed and revised to the best of his ability, the question of getting it published arose. In 1860 Harris dispatched it to Henry Bohn in England. Many of you probably recall seeing volumes of Bonn's Classical Library and similar sets of translations of the major works in various fields, which were fairly standard items in the last half of the 19th century and still appear in second-hand bookstores. Certainly Bohn's was the most likely publishing house for an English translation of Hegel's Logic. But Bohn returned the manuscript, pleading that the blockade and counterblockades of the Civil War made transatlantic publishing unfeasible. But probably the operative part of the reply was Bohn's comment that he would have had to hire someone to turn the translation into English.

Here Bohn undoubtedly had a point. No German philosopher from Kant on has come easily into English, and Hegel offers as many formidable obstacles to translation as any. Beyond that, Brokmeyer was hardly the man to do it. After all, neither his German nor his English had been refined and polished by those formal educational mills which, whatever their other shortcomings, do help lay a groundwork of that decency and clarity requisite for any advanced literary effort.

One anecdote will possibly illuminate the situation. When Brokmeyer was wooing his first wife, in honor of her birthday he translated into English a German love poem. The young lady's comment reputedly was, "Henry, into whatever language did you translate that poem? You know I only speak English." When a translator cannot turn a love poem into an English that his fiancee can understand, he is certain to be frustrated in attempting to render Hegel's Logic in an intelligible fashion.

As we shall see, Brokmeyer kept reworking the manuscript. What's more, friends and, later, family, kept trying to find someone to put the translation into printable shape. But those with an adequate knowledge of Hegel were unlikely to undertake what was essentially hackwork, while the willing but unerudite translator was likely to founder on the shoals of the Hegelian mode of philosophizing.

The failure of their great Bible to find publication was always a source of reproach among the St. Louis group. Certainly, publication of the volume would have spread Brokmeyer's reputation and would have obviously tied him to the movement he had fathered. Snider felt that Harris should have run it serially in the Journal of Speculative Philosophy, a policy he followed in regard to at least parts of other translations of German authors made by that group. Yet Snider himself, who set up his own Sigma Publishing Company to bring out his own numerous works, never undertook to print Brokmeyer's Logic, despite his great admiration for the man. Eventually in 1890 Harris published his own translation (with commentary) of a large part of Hegel's Logic. In the preface he recalls Brokmeyer's influence on the St. Louis group and their early activities. But he nowhere mentions Brokmeyer's translation. Harris apparently felt that the only thing to do was to walk away from the wreck and make a fresh start. So the Logic remained unprinted and Brokmeyer remained unknown beyond his small circle of admirers.

In 1859 another of those overpowering urges toward solitude enveloped Brokmeyer. Having worked steadily in the stove factory, living on very little and saving the rest of his pay, he was able to buy some land in Warren County, to which he withdrew with only a dog for company. Harris and the other young men of St. Louis gave him a small subsidy out of their very modest salaries so that he could take the time to continue to polish his translation of the Logic and also to work on other major Hegelian texts such as the Phenomenalogy of the Spirit and the Philosophy of History, rather than be totally dependent on his activities as a farmer for a livelihood.

But Brokmeyer never wanted to be a permanent hermit, and his Hegelianism was also against it. According to Hegelian doctrine, individual and particular man means very little. Man can become truly man only by finding his place in those great educating and civilizing

institutions--the family, the school, vocation, civil society, the political state, and religion. Brokmeyer had engaged in school and vocation; and he didn't want religion in the accepted sense. But the other institutions beckoned.

In 1861 he took himself a wife; and with his marriage he devoted less time to philosophy and began to take part in social and political matters. In the early days of the Civil War he joined the militia and was made a lieutenant-colonel. From 1862-64 he served in the state legislature. Although he had been elected as a "War Democrat" he spent most of his time countering the activities of those who wished to disfranchize all those sympathetic to the cause of the South. Later events gave these endeavors of his a very ironic twist.

At some point in this general period (don't ask when), he read law and set himself up in practice in St. Louis. But according to Snider, who resigned his post in the St. Louis schools in order to enter Brokmeyer's office (not to learn law but, as he said, "to matriculate in the University Brokmeyer,") the office was not the site of much legal business but primarily a gathering place for politicians.

The same personal magnetism and force which had charmed the young men of the Philosophical Society also seem to have won over the politicians and the voters. In 1866 Brokmeyer was elected alderman in St. Louis. In 1870 he was elected to the state senate and played a major role in the state constitutional convention. Indeed there are those who say that he was essentially the father of Missouri's second constitution. Next he won the race for lieutenant-governor and served as acting governor during the long illness of Governor Phelps. With his political career at its height, he tried for the U.S. Senate; but tragically and ironically, the Copperheads, whose interests he had so vigorously defended, refused to support him but ran and elected one of their own number.

Hurt, Brokmeyer withdrew completely from politics and joined the legal staff of the Gould railroads, the Missouri Pacific and the M. K. and T., and worked there from 1880-90. One suspects that he chose these roads because they ran into the western wilderness, for apparently at intervals he still went roving by himself or occasionally lived for a time with some Indian tribe. In 1890 he retired to devote his time to further work on his still unpublished translation of the Logic and to an attempt to develop for English a vocabulary and modes of expression for "pure thought" comparable to those that Hegel had developed for German.

The ending in 1906 is a fitting close to the career of this eternally devoted yet eternally frustrated translator of Hegel's Logic. On his deathbed he was asked by his family what they should do with that still unpublished manuscript of his translation, on which he had labored for half a century. "Let the insects have it now," he replied, "I have enjoyed every hour I have spent working on it." But the insects didn't get it. A copy reposes in the collection of the Missouri Historical

Society.

The translation has not, however, remained completely unpublished. In 1974 William Goetzmann published a book of selections from the works of American Hegelians, and there a snippet of Brokmeyer's translation is finally published, a century and a quarter after the translator started to work. But that selection runs for 8 pages; the most recent English translation of the Science of Logic, that of A. V. Miller, runs to 844. Even at this late date Brokmeyer has not found his monument.

This sketch has, I hope, at least suggested the varied reasons why historians and biographers have not been keeping Brokmeyer's memory green. A very complex and many-sided man, his likeness would not be an easy one to catch under the best of circumstances. Even a biographer working with an abundance of authentic material would have a hard time portraying Brokmeyer's mercurial temperament with its wildly swinging moods, interests, and activities. In the face of the relative paucity of materials, much of it obviously untrustworthy, reputable scholars have looked elsewhere and have left the field open to me.

SOURCES

Brokmeyer's alleged journal was edited and published after his death by his son, Eugene C. Brokmeyer, A Mechanic's Diary (Washington, D. C.: E. C. Brokmeyer, 1910). The other "fictional" account mentioned in the text is J. G. Woemer's The Rebel's Daughter (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1899).

Denton J. Snider's facts and opinions are scattered through his The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Literature, Education, Psychology (St. Louis: Sigma Publishing Co., 1920) and A Writer of Books in his Genesis (St. Louis: Sigma Publishing Co., 1910). Other recollections of contemporaries with the movement appear in Charles M. Perry's The St. Louis Movement in Philosophy: Some Source Materials (Norman, Okla.: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1930) and D. H. Harris's A Brief Report on the Meeting Commemorative of the Early St. Louis Movement in Philosophy, Psychology, Literature, Art. (The copy I have seen lists no publisher and no date, but Perry cites as The Early St. Louis Movement (Los Angeles, 1922). George H. Howison offers the most dramatic account of the meeting between Brokmeyer and Harris in the informal talk he gave as professor emeritus to the Faculty Club of the University of California, "St. Louis Reminiscences," on January 6, 1916. (A stenographic report is in the G. H. Howison collection at the University of California, Berkeley, Film C-B, 1037).

Ernest Southerland Bates's account of Brokmeyer in the third volume of the Dictionary of American Biography is based on information from Brokmeyer's son, Eugene.

30

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF A PERSISTENT JOURNAL

by

Robert E. Belding
Professor of Educational History
and
Coordinator, Social Foundations of Education
University of Iowa

The Professional Setting

The year 1875 on our educational-professional scene looked something like this: with graduate schools evolving from a well tried German pattern, our education had joined other fields in starting to splinter into specializations. The declared mental faculties were beginning to be challenged and educators were digesting unprecedented volumes of more-or-less helpful printed material. Our own periodicals continued to enter, then exist, from under the academic proscenium, with the average life expectancy of eleven years.[1] At the turning point in the half century--just a hundred years ago, Kiddle and Schem courageously produced their single-volumed Encyclopedia of Education, which claimed to be pansophic in its pedagogical embrace.[2]

Educational innovations and trends were not confined to the printed word; our own history books tell us that a century ago the University of Michigan was moving into its control over the entire state's public school system.[3] While this was imminent in our midwest, over in New York, Columbia University was verging on assuming an independent teachers college under its mothering wing; Nicholas Murray Butler mounted to the presidency of Columbia and for fifty years was to stamp his indelible imprint upon that school and upon its Teachers' College.

Within the classrooms of our institutions, the single-theory course in education was maturing into specialized offerings in teacher preparation, in methods, in broad curricular schemes, and in such substantive offerings as school management and buildings.

Indication of a few extramural events of 1875 are necessary to complement our setting. For example, that was the first year that a greenback was honored as equivalent to a silver dollar, and I have been reminded that it was the first year that Iowa raised more corn than wheat.[4]

Educational Journals Prior to 1875

What had already happened in the inky realm of educational publications? The first educational journal in our country was established in New York as The Academician in the year 1818; that first part of the nineteenth century was an age of early infant mortality,

and this enterprising baby expired before he was toilet trained--in less than two years. More successful and enduring were William Russell's and Henry Barnard's famous issues. But ultimately, magazine deaths were more common that survivals for, as Davis points out, 30 educational periodicals were born before 1850, and only nine of these remained extant through that mid-century year; within two years after that, two of these had expired. At that time of the educational awakening, only three educational journals lasted more than a decade.[5]

Procreation of Our Oldest Extant Journal

This is intended to be a history of the Journal of Education; mainly through its golden anniversary. Even as careful a scholar as our own Edward Krug confused the founding of our main concern here--the New England Journal of Education, with other come-and-go periodicals of the 1875 era. Easily Krug mixed up this Journal of Education with a magazine called Education which was also launched by the man who started the New England Journal of Education. His name was Thomas W. Bicknell. The Journal came on the scene first, and his Education magazine was founded five years later and went through five editors before it was put to rest in 1916. (It would seem that any succession of five editors in 36 years should encourage ANY magazine into its grave.)

By contrast, during its first three quarters of a century our New England Journal of Education had only three editors for its first seventy-seven years. Its founder, Tom Bicknell, held with it until 1886, when Albert E. Winship was to take over and pilot it through an astounding 47 years. Winship's was a lengthier tenure than any education editor in our country before or since![7]

Only one other editor/publisher was to run the Journal of Education until it was sold in 1952 to Boston University, 77 years after its creation. This third editor was to manage it through Winship's faltering years, then was to hold it together with frail thread through the depression years and until he retired. Since he surrendered it to Boston University's School of Education, each issue--now as a quarterly--has been addressed to different narrowed research themes, and has contained mainly articles by those aspiring to promotions within its sponoring institution.

Analysis of a Sample Issue, 1875

This has constituted a very brief overview of the Journal's succession of editors and publishers. Let us return now to the first issues as turned out by Thomas Bicknell who created the magazine. The first sheet of the new publication came off the press on January 1, 1875. In that year its founder created what he called the New England Publishing Company, and his New England Journal of Education was to be his first and most enduring product. Bicknell was called the Journal's "conductor." (More accurately he might have been called its

motorman, for he alone kept it on its track.) To form this periodical, which was to be our nation's first weekly for educators, Conductor Bicknell bought out and consolidated five monthlies which were mainly the organs of New England state educational associations; Vermont and New Hampshire were the states not represented, and one of Connecticut's two purchases was run out of Yale College.[8] Bicknell purchased the subscription lists of these five publications and thus established an excellent foundation for an assured circulation for his new journal. His appeal in the newly amalgamated weekly was to be exclusively within New England, thus perpetuating the charisma of its five parents. He named both his new company and its journal for this geographic confinement, yet it was to remain New Englandish for only eleven years.[9]

Although its subscribers were to be confined to Yankees mainly east of the Berkshires, it attracted a broad and general northeastern clientele, catering to all levels and school specialties. This breadth of appeal was to remain with it through its first three editors and for more than three-quarters of a century.

Cost of the first issue was 6 cents and it was sixteen pages thick. (Today's single-issue cost of the quarterly issue is $2.00.) In 1875 the cost of an annual subscription of 52 issues was $3.00. Notice that in those days it was published straight through the summer months.

The initial copy was quite representative of what was contained in subsequent issues under its first editor, Tom Bicknell. It was to be as ubiquitous as Barnard's, with articles on school history as well as contemporary reforms; as in the case of Barnard's journal, many of the articles were in its editor's own words. That first edition contained an article by a principal of a New Hampshire academy, a description and plan of Rogers High School in Newport, Rhode Island, and a professorial emission from Brown University. It also yielded examples from examination questions from the Manchester, New Hampshire schools, and a regular department was launched, called "Education News by States." Of course the only states were those within New England. All this was embellished by four romantic poems concerning classrooms, presumably within New England.

Beyond the first issue, but contained within the initial volume of the new Journal, were other representative examples forecasting the emphasis of Bicknell's publication. There was a contribution on the Concord, Massachusetts school philosophy, several on Boston's unisexual English and Latin institutions, and one on the normal school, naming it as a strictly New England enterprise. The Quincy Method appeared in print as did two articles penned by Elizabeth Peabody.

Thomas Bicknell built a small empire in his Boston publications. As has been indicated, he confused his publications involvement by launching a monthly called Education in 1880. At that time he was

actually running three school journals from his one office. In addition, his New England Publishing Company produced several books. He was inclined to be a wheeler-dealer, and became overly involved, neglecting portions of his empire. As in the case of Henry Barnard, he used his publications as his personal-professional mouthpiece.

Ubiquity via Winship

Although Bicknell never pushed his Journal's subscriptions or advertising beyond the hills of Massachusetts, his own reputation as a competent educator was spreading; even before he surrendered his conductorship he became president of the National Education Association. Shortly afterward he sold his New England Publishing Company and its main Journal to the Reverend Albert Edward Winship. This deal was transacted in 1886, exactly eleven years after the Journal's birth. Bicknell's name and words were retained for only four issues after he sold it, for Winship was to prove himself to be a one-man leader-a dictator with a touch of contact with the Almighty.

There was a taint of revenge in Winship's purchase. He had been a student editor of The Massachusetts Teacher, one of the five journals that had been snuffed out by Bicknell to create his all-New England weekly. By his consolidation, Bicknell had eased Winship out of a part-time job. Winship was to regain editorial ground by acquiring the Journal eleven years after its founding, and was to remain editor for an astronomical 47 years, yet was never once referred to as its conductor.

Elsewhere I have detailed the story of Winship's many faceted contributions to national education; his Journal was only one manifestation of his remarkably active, optimistic, durable and useful life.[10] His money for purchasing the Journal and its publishing company came from his family which was of venerated New England stock and which controlled the principal Boston newspapers of the day. To this day the Winships run the Boston Globe, and for several years the name of the Reverend Albert Edward Winship appeared as Editor in Chief on the masthead of the Boston Traveler, a leading afternoon daily.

Winship's imprint was to show from the start on the Journal. Immediately after his take-over, he deparochialized the magazine, removing the prefix New England from the title and relabelling it somewhat cautiously The Journal of Education: for School People in New England and Beyond. A cursory review of both its news coverage and its advertising reflects this immediate movement outward: this same outreach we know was already being reflected in Harvard's appeal, sparked by Eliot's famous inaugural address and Winship himself, we shall see, was from the start more a national than a Boston figure. Indeed, among the very few words inscribed by Bicknell when Winship joined his Journal were indications that Winship already had built himself a commendable reputation beyond the New England hills.[11]

In his first editorial after taking over the Journal, Winship himself declared that his new organ was to sound two purposes: it was to build

men and to alert people to what was going on nationally in education, including lobbying and legislation in Washington.[12] Throughout his half century as editor, Winship was often to alter the content and format of his Journal yet these twin purposes he was to retain and reinforce across the pages of his publication.

As an ardent promoter of education through the turn of the century, Winship wore a variety of hats. It is our main concern here to treat his perennial effort as editor of the Journal of Education over a period of almost half a century, yet he was to spend very few days in the editorial office of the Journal--looking out from a Beacon Street address in Boston, contemplating the extraordinary clutch of revolutionary graves--Paul Revere, John Hancock, Mother Goose and Samuel Adams--in the Granary Burying Ground which huddled below his office window. "Other" Winships which detracted from his tireless lecturing circuits were his dedicated selflessness to building the N.E.A. and his animated teachers' agency where he saw to it that for a sizable price his chosen professional friends gained promotions to better positions. Indeed, the Journal, his solid newspaper contacts, his transcontinental lectures, and his placement service constituted a well coordinated machine.

It worked something like this: let us say that a high school principal decided it was time to move upward toward a superintendency in a larger community. Rather than returning to graduate school for this promotion he would contact Winship who would reply, asking that the ambitious principal arrange a lecture for all teachers of his community--a lecture that required a handsome honorarium plus expenses for Winship. The latter would lock a lecture commitment in the principal's town into one of his two annual tours across the United States, and as consequence of Winship's PR talents, the community would not only learn that Winship was an extraordinary educator and public lecturer, but that the community had in its midst an eminent man as its school principal. If the principal's salary was elevated to retain him in the community, Winship billed him ten per cent of his new salary through his placement agency. If the man moved forward into another community as consequence of the Reverend Winship's efforts, Winship billed him ten per cent of the man's newly contracted salary.[13] At any rate, editor Winship would spend a few pages in his Journal of Eduation extolling the remarkable virtues of this man. Indeed, his Journal remained throughout his life as an editorial promoter of Winship's professional friends; during his lengthy tenure with the magazine he never considered it a source of personal income; it was his expensive toy, for his remunerative lectures, his teachers' agency and his wealthy family subsidized his Journal operation.

A few of the men he extolled and was directly or indirectly responsible for placing before the public eye through his elaborate assembly line were: William Crabtree of the N.E.A., and Joy Elmer Morgan who still, in his retirement, looks back on Winship as major promoter of his own literary cause.[14] Others he helped were George

Strayer, Ella Flagg Young, Ellwood Cubberley and John Ward Studebaker.[15]

Winship was far more than an enterprising capitalist. In addition to never expecting to break even with his Journal, he spent his life promoting the N.E.A. and never charged this burgeoning association for his many lectures and concomitant expenses in its behalf. Perhaps the best known point at which he coupled his charity between the Journal and the N.E.A. enterprises was in 1912 and 13 when he encouraged and helped found the Journal of the National Education Association, fighting for Joy Elmer Morgan to become its first editor. He campaigned for this through the pages of his own Journal, even though he knew that another general educational publication, supported by dues from a national organization, would cut deeply into his own Journal's circulation and appeal.

Winship confined much of his dedicated effort to strengthening the national professional organization; yet he was capable of taking sides against other literary threats to his own magazine's existence. The year after the Reverend's ascension to head the Journal he was to enter battle with another man of the cloth in Chicago who started another broadly appealing weekly for schoolmen. The midwest production was called Educational Weekly, and Winship damned from his editorial pulpit his pastoral competitor.[16] He felt there was neither room for such another weekly, nor that the other pastor had sufficient school background to run another weekly. Compared to Winship's weekly, the Chicago issues were short-lived, for in 1891 the Educational Weekly was to expire. From the autumn of 1882 until March 1891 there were 37 references to this battle incorporated between the covers of Winship's Journal.

The Parade of Themes

More mutable to Winship than his established purposes for his Journal of Education were the themes which were picked up, given exposure, then dropped by him. Much of Winship's own character, as well as that of his Journal, is clarified by reviewing these thrusts. First he was to perpetuate a theme already pioneered by him in adult education--his concern for creating literates out of the newly disgorged immigrants into the Boston slums. In this effort he was to establish his place within the history of adult education.[17] This theme of literacy for immigrants appeared in early issues of Winship's newly acquired mouthpiece and was perpetuated into the initial decade of the twentieth century.

Related to what the Reverend Winship once referred to as his "pastoral genes" was his never failing interest in character development among children and youths. Components of character which he identified and reiterated were mainly to be found in extrapolations of Bible stories combined with the scout oath. Both his editorials and

articles insisted that character development should be built into all aspects of the school curriculum, and in 1929 he called upon a friend, Joseph Egan, to write a regular column for the Journal to be called "Character Chats." These "Chats" ran through almost 3 years of publication in the Journal and many of them were extended and refined from Egan's book, Character Chats with the New England Publishing Company's imprint. (1926)

From the early pages of Winship's editorship onward he wrote often of the faculty or mental disciplines. When these were challenged by Thorndike and others mainly centered at Teachers' College, Winship was to remain staunchly on the side of the traditional disciplinarians. Although he proved often to be a man ready to change with new educational postures, he never surrendered his stance on the value of disciplines.

But men of his generation were inclined to take an unyielding stand on one side or the other of an argument. Perhaps because of his own professed "Puritan genes," Winship often wrote so vigorously about the solitary importance of heredity that he indicated that children were reared in a vacuum of no environmental consequence. His contemplations on this matter often spilled across his Journal pages and were soberly summarized, often to the glee of today's reader, in his own volume titled Heredity.[18]

At more than one point Winship was to oppose acceptance of Utah as a new state. He was to intone ministerially that "until the state of Utah has less wives per male it should not be admitted to the union."[19]

Although Winship always related these themes adroitly to public schooling, others of his subjects were more directly based in school matters. For three years his speeches and writings against the standardization of school texts by powerful foundations peppered the Journal's pages, but culminated in his fiery speech before the National Education Association's annual meeting in 1914.[20]

Through his Journal pages Winship fought for an expansion of the school curriculum, reiterating a theme still familiar to us today. He sought an adaptable curriculum that would embrace such extracurricular questionables as physical education, art and music. He was an early promoter of fully utilizing the schoolhouse as a community center. This thrust was apparent in Journal issues running both in his own editorials and in the guest authors he invited into his pages, mainly within the two decades that spanned the turn of the century.

His themes were reiterated by his selection of writers who wrote, usually upon his invitation, for the Journal. A casual perusal of Journal volumes through the Winship era displays over and over again such names as George Strayer, Harold Rugg, John Ward Studebaker, William T. Harris, Nicholas Murray Butler and Ellwood Cubberley. In the days

before televised press conferences, two of our nation's presidents were to inscribe their educational views through the Journal by invitation from Winship. It must be remembered that he remained in tune with what transpired in Washington by being on location at critical legislative moments in the nation's capitol.

Winship's own open-mindedness on some issues is indicated in his invitation extended to (and accepted by) Charles W. Eliot to write for the Journal during a time that Winship himself was proclaiming the dangers inherent in the Report of the Committee of Ten.

By no means were Winship's themes confined to his Journal's pages. The same emphases were to tumble across lecture platforms at N.E.A. meetings as he delivered major lectures during 46 conventions. Davis credits him with writing and speaking more words than did William Torrey Harris, who had been proclaimed the most prolific inscriber and deliverer of academic words in his time. As to his Journal of Education, his contribution as editor there seems to fit well with Gabriel Compayre's established ideal of what an educational editor should be. Compayre, declared:

> The essential thing in an enterprise of this nature, as in all other human enterprises, is that it should have at its head a man who is the soul of it, whose strong will shapes every detail of its publication, who by his own personal experience and personal knowledge is in the mid-current of scholastic affairs, and finally whose mine and heart are well-springs of inspiration and enthusiasm.[22]

This may appear to be too fine a model for even a Frenchman to order up, but Winship holds up well against such a formidable and well reasoned set of criteria.

The Second Half-Century

The history of our venerable professional periodical might well be packaged to end conveniently in 1925, the golden anniversary point in its existence. In that year, a partner joined Winship to act as resident editor and to assist Winship through impending years of decline; by then Winship had reached his 80th year, yet he was still making two Pullman circuits a year, speaking in most of our then 48 states, and attending and contributing faithfully to the N.E.A.'s annual meetings. The only convention meeting he missed attending after his twentieth birthday was the one taking place in Atlantic City in the summer of 1932; that would have been his 68th year of consecutive attendance!

Little should be said from this point onward in the Journal's history, lest the words become subjective and biased, for the man who joined Winship's editorial staff in 1925 was my own father, Anson Wood Belding. Winship was to remain nominal editor of the Journal for more

than seven years, yet many of its management details had already been left in the lap of a dedicated, even worshipping, amanuensis. Belding, commonly referred to by his acronym "A.W.B.," was to perform the main editing tasks and put each by-then monthly issue to bed. While he continued to retain the non-specialized appeal which had characterized the Journal from its inception, he brought to its pages an overall news dimension which had been transferred from his talents as chief editorial writer for one of Boston's afternoon dailies. Thus his Journal page titled "News Digest" became quickly identified with the new editor.

During the Belding years his Journal, like the aging citizen it was becoming, was to take on fresh cosmetics both externally and internally, and to redistribute its weight to more manageable proportions.

Yet the major change brought to the Journal by A.W.B. came as consequence of his conversion of it to a paying operation. Belding senior maintained at home an adaptable wife and a ravenously hungry gaggle of college-bent children, and his solitary source of income was to be the Journal; as long as Winship lived he (Winship) was to oppose this mercenary shift as he continued to honor his friends through often expensively illustrated pages extolling their virtues. Winship was active to his very own end in running and contributing to his Journal. He was to expire in mid-depression, and from there on A.W.B. was to build both its circulation and advertising through economically difficult years. Under him the Journal tried on a never ending string of new ideas, with aerated departments and eventually with a move to copious quarters on Park Street, looking on Boston Common.

A.W.B. was not a peripatetic lecturer, nor did he maintain direct contacts with legislation in Washington. The Winship Teachers' Agency had preceded Winship in death, so there was no perpetuation of this involvement. A.W.B. did, however, encourage aspiring writers to get started through the pages of his magazine. For example, Bill Brickman, who was later to take over School and Society (now Intellect), recently cleared his own historical files and sent me the first letter of acceptance he had ever received for an article. It was from A.W.B., dated December 30, 1940, and it stated that the article would be printed in the Journal if Brickman would reduce his weighty footnotes. Brickman, though he condensed his footnotes with reluctance, recalls this as a major prod toward his non-stop production of articles and books. (You will recall that Brickman spoke to us here in this room just two years ago.)

Like so many others who are in business for themselves, A.W.B. clung to his Journal until after his seventieth birthday. In 1952 he negotiated its sale to Boston University's School of Education where it has gone the way of many comparable periodicals to become an "occasional quarterly," reporter of educational research, with an assigned theme for each issue.

The Journal of Education's overall history has not been an easy one. It has weathered severe bruises and declines, but its editors have stuck with it, helping to bring it, uniquely among America's education periodicals, to celebration of its centennial year.

NOTES

[1] Sheldon Emmor Davis, "General List of Educational Periodicals," *Educational Periodicals During the Nineteenth Century.* Bureau of Education Bulletin 1919 No. 28. (Washington, 1919), pp. 113-115.

[2] Henry Kiddle and Alexander J. Schem, *Encyclopedia of Education.* (New York, 1876), p. iv.

[3] Elizabeth M. Farrand, *History of the University of Michigan.* (Ann Arbor, 1885), p. 71.

[4] Albert Edward Winship, "Golden Year Issue," *Journal of Education* (Jan. 1, 1925), p. 14.

[5] Harry G. Good, "From Schoolkeeping to Teaching," Chapter VI, *A History of American Education.* (New York, 1956.)

[6] Within this article the names *Journal of Education, New England Journal of Education* and *The Journal* will be used interchangeably.

[7] Correspondence from Lawrence Winship to the author, May 17, 1972.

[8] According to Davis the five monthlies multiple-married into the new *Journal* were: *Maine Journal of Education, Massachusetts Teacher, Rhode Island Schoolmaster, Connecticut School Journal* and *College Courant.* Davis, op. cit., p. 102.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Anson W. Belding, lead editorial (obituary) on Winship's life, *Journal of Education,* (March 6, 1933), p. 113.

[11] Thomas Bicknell editorial, *New England Journal of Education,* (March 11, 1886), p. 152.

[12] Albert E. Winship editorial, *Journal of Education,* (April 8, 1886), p. 311.

[13] While serving as office boy for Winship's *Journal* this writer became involuntarily enmeshed with the editor's empire as he delivered messages and ran errands for his employer and for Alvin Pease, resident manager of the Winship Teachers' Agency. The sequence is thus verified by personal experience of the writer with Winship's enterprises. Furthermore, correspondence from Lawrence L. Winship (son of Albert E.) dated March 17, 1972 reinforces the orderly succession of the Winship machine.

[14] Correspondence from Morgan to the writer, July 6, 1973.

[15] Paul Clifford Pickett, "National Forum Experiment," Chapter IV, *Contributions of John Ward Studebaker to American Education.* (Iowa City, 1967, unpublished dissertation), p. 49.

[16] Davis, op. cit., p. 52.

[17] George Francis James (ed.) *The Handbook of University Extension* (Philadelphia, 1893) pp. 241-244.

[18] Albert E. Winship, *Heredity* (Boston, 1900)

[19] Albert E. Winship, "The Educational Cure of Mormonism," *Journal of Education*, (September 12, 1886) p. 1023.

[20] Albert E. Winship, *Journal of Proceedings of the National Education Association of the United States*, (Washington, 1915), pp. 274-275.

[21] From a review of all issues of the *Journal of Proceedings of the N.E.A.* by the author from the initial issue through 1932.

[22] Gabriel Compayre, "Educational Journalism in France," *Educational Review*, (1900), p. 137.

SCHOOL GOVERNANCE BY WOMEN:

THE STEPPINGSTONE TO POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Kay Hodes Kamin, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Rosary College
River Forest, Illinois

Although American women have been eligible to vote and to hold public office without restrictions for almost sixty years, it is still considered somewhat of a novelty for a woman to be elected or appointed to local, state, or national posts. Because men have always outnumbered women in political life, the roles of governmental leader and decision maker have taken on a masculine image. Somehow, it has seemed unfeminine for a woman to become too closely involved in politics or to hold a public office. Such sexual stereotyping has tended to discourage women from entering the American political arena or from seeking positions of political authority.

There is, however, at least one exception to the traditional masculine image in politics. This is the office of school board member. Since the late nineteenth century, women not only have sought election and appointment to schoolboard positions, but for the last eighty years have been serving successfully in this capacity. Their jobs include decision making powers over such areas as school financing, the curriculum, the hiring and firing of school personnel, teacher benefits and textbooks.

Because of the obvious contrast which school-board women offer to traditional political stereotyping and because of the current interest in politics by women, it seems relevant and important to take a closer look at the first area of our nation's political activity in which women enjoyed full participation. In assessing the historic significance of school governance by women, this paper will focus on the origins of such participation and its affect upon public school policy and upon the feminist struggle for political equality in America. It will also try to draw some tentative conclusions about the significance of this experience for today's feminist movement.

Available evidence suggests that the origins of school governance by women can be traced back to ideas germinated by leaders of the common school movement in the early nineteenth century. In order to hire cheap labor for the new tax supported public schools, these leaders tried to alter traditional notions of female passivity by encouraging women to enter the job market and become public school teachers. The kinds of ideas advanced by these leaders, and the wide acceptance with which they were met, seemed to prepare the public mind to accept arguments concerning school governance by women which were advanced at the end of the nineteenth century.

One of the major ideas of the common school founders concerned the appropriateness of involving women in school activities. According to this view, women were the natural and proper teachers of children within the home and, therefore, they were the natural and proper teachers of children outside the home.[1] This idea directly contradicted the prevailing practice of hiring male schoolmasters to teach children at the elementary and secondary levels. This enlarged view of the educative role of women was later used to validate claims that it was both appropriate and desirable for women to serve on school boards and to vote in school elections. As one proponent of school governance by women told a newspaper reporter in 1887:[2]

> There are many things of which a woman is conversant which would make her eminently fitter for a place in the management of schools (than men)...A woman better understands some of the needs of scholars, especially younger ones.

A second idea, widely circulated by common school founders, concerned the availability of women to perform school functions. According to this view, women had more free time to devote to educational activities than their male counterparts. Men were too busily occupied with the "accumulation of property and the attaining of distinction to be interested in keeping school"[3]

Those who favored school goverance by women drew upon the same argument concerning female availability to advance their cause. For example, when school governance by women was being urged for Chicago near the turn of the century, one proponent explained:[4]

> The strong point in favor of (putting women on the school board)...is that women have the time and will attend to the work. The men say that their time is taken up with business, and, of course, it is true.

Another said:[5]

> A businessman may be able to give up an evening once a week to the discussion of certain details and school management...but he is not able to leave his shop or office twice or thrice a week during school hours and visit primary or grammar schools to see whether they are well managed.

The third, and perhaps most convincing argument for female participation in school government was based, not upon any specific idea of the common school leaders, but upon their success in inducing women to enter the teaching profession. The practice of hiring female teachers was firmly established by the mid-nineteenth century and had reached overwhelming proportions by the century's end. In 1890, approximately 65.5 per cent of the nation's teachers were women.[6] For large cities in the United States, the estimates were even higher. Nearly

nine out of every ten teaching positions in the major urban areas were held by women.[7] Those who supported school governance by women insisted that such statistics entitled women to a broader role in running the schools.

In addition to such precedents, available evidence also suggests that American women were able to build a consensus about the importance of female participation in school governance long before they were able to forge agreement on the necessity for female participation in other areas of political activity. A brief examination into the process by which school governance by women was achieved in two major urban areas, Chicago and Boston, will help demonstrate the way in which this consensus was built and the nature of the opposition which confronted it. Chicago and Boston seem appropriate for this examination because they led the nation in giving women school board positions. They also reflect the two means of attaining office; by appointment as in Chicago, and by election, as in Boston.

It is doubtful that Chicago would rank among the first cities to appoint school-board women had it not been for the persistent and prolonged efforts of the prestigious Chicago Woman's Club. This club, comprised of socially prominent and economically elite Chicago women, provided the necessary leadership and sustained interest to forge a consensus on the importance of school governance by women and to overcome conservative opposition to female school appointments.

According to available evidence, the members of the Chicago Woman's Club, like members of similar clubs in other cities, first began to concentrate upon the question of female participation in school government in the 1870's.[8] Readily accepting the notion that their roles as wives and mothers engendered public and not just private responsibilities, these women began to discuss the possibility of broadening their control over the education of their children. As one source explained:[9]

> Women's Clubs are discussing the public school systems; they are comparing notes on the education of their children; they are scrutinizing and passing upon the qualifications of teachers. Realizing their great common interest in the schools, they are beginning to inquire into the way school boards are chosen, and the question is mooted in their clubs whether women should not have a voice in choosing the members of the school board, or in fact whether it wouldn't be a good thing to have a few of their own sex placed on such boards.

Armed with this growing consensus, the Chicago Woman's Club sent a formal petition to Mayor Monroe Heath in 1877 requesting the appointment of two of its members to vacancies on the school board.[10] The petition was signed by members of the Woman's Club, some of their husbands, and other influential men in the city. The petition also received immediate support in the local newspapers.

Four of the major points presented in the petition reflected some of the ideas of the common school leaders in the early nineteenth century. The first three points dealt with the appropriateness and the practicality of appointing women to the school board. The petition read:[11]

> The interest of the women of Chicago in all matters pertaining to education, whether as mothers, teachers of citizens, being as great as men, entitles them to a voice in all that concerns the public schools of our city.
>
> Women have shown such superior ability, fitness, and fidelity whenever entrusted with a share of the educational work as teachers, principals of schools...or trustees as to entitle them to still higher positions of trust.
>
> The work of a large number of the 19 standing committees of our board, notably those relating to rules and regulations, special studies, textbooks, courses of instruction, salaries, appointment of teachers, libraries, and sanitary affairs need and should have, the counsel and action of women and men.

A final point in the petition related to the overwhelming number of women teachers employed in Chicago by that time. It read:[12]

> There are 1,250 female to 50 male teachers in the public schools of Chicago. The interests of these women teachers should not be confided entirely to men.

Although female principals and teachers in Chicago played no apparent role in either writing or signing the petition, they seemed eager to be a party to a consensus on the importance of female school governance. When interviewed in the Chicago press on this issue, female teachers and principals without exception favored the appointment of women to the Board of Education. As one teacher commented:[13]

> I am not by any means a believer in women suffrage, but I think the idea of electing women to the Board of Education is an excellent one.

Despite the growing enthusiasm for school governance by women in Chicago, the Mayor politely declined the petition. Using a typically Victorian argument, the Mayor explained that it would be quite improper for a woman to sit on the same school board with men. Many subjects came up for discussion in the board meetings, said the Mayor, which "were not exactly suitable topics of conversation between men and women."[15] A woman's presence at such meetings would "at least be embarrassing, and might prevent that freedom of speech and expression of opinion which the educational interests demanded."[16] The Mayor, however, refrained from elaborating on the kind of topics which might be inhibited by the presence of a woman on the board.

Two additional reasons for the Mayor's decision were suggested by a local newspaper editorial. In contrast to the Mayor's public reason for his refusal, these reasons seem to approximate more closely the kind of subtle obstacles which still confront women in politics today. The first reason dealt with purely political considerations. Following the standard assumption that political appointments are best used for the payment of political debts, the editorial suggested that a female appointment to the board would be "to squander after the most wasteful fashion something which is exclusively meant for the payment of political debts."[17]

The second reason, suggested by the editorial for the Mayor's reluctance to appoint school-board women, was based on the popular sexual stereotype that women had no head for business. Thus women were "not fitted for the handling of financial transactions, the oversight of architects and the selection of sights."[18] All of these were important responsibilities of school board members.

Although the Woman's Club petition did not immediately achieve its purpose, one tangible outgrowth of the agitation to appoint women to the school board was the promotion of two women principals as assistant superintendents of schools.[19] A newspaper story, applauding these appointments, also tried to console the women of Chicago by suggesting that these two appointments would give them greater control over education in Chicago than would appointments to the school board. The reasoning was that these appointments gave women some control over "educational work", while board members were simply concerned with "business".[20] To some extent, this prediction proved true when one of these women, Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, went on to become the first woman Superintendent of the Chicago Schools. In this way, Mrs. Young became the first woman ever to hold such a high administrative school post in the United States and one of the few women who have ever done so.

Without recourse to the ballot box or courts and apparently unwilling to risk any further agitation which might be considered unladylike, the members of the Chicago Woman's Club had no alternative but to accept the Mayor's decision. However, they immediately established an Educational Committee whose major function it was to draft and circulate petitions to the Mayor whenever a vacancy on the school board occurred. Eleven years, four petitions, and three mayors later, the Chicago Woman's Club finally achieved its goal. In 1888, Mayor John Roche agreed to appoint Mrs. Ellen Mitchell, a popular member of the Woman's Club, to the Board of Education.[21] Although no explanation is available as to why Mayor Roche was willing to make such an appointment when his predecessors were not, one newspaper speculated that the election of a few women to school boards in some small suburban districts in Illinois might have had some influence on his decision.

In contrast to the lengthy, but sedate way, in which Chicago finally appointed school-board women, the effort to elect women to the Boston School Committee turned into a public brouhaha. The situation all started quietly enough in 1874 when an all male electorate elected four prominent women to serve on the school board. Accounts of this election indicate that the women were considered to be highly qualified for the job and "were elected by large majorities and virtually without a struggle."[22] The four women were Miss Abbie W. May, a Boston philanthropist; Miss Lucia M. Peabody, a former Boston school teacher; Miss Lucretia Crocker, the daughter of a prominent businessman and who had served on the faculty of Antioch College; and Mrs. Ann Adeline Badger, an Oberlin graduate, who managed one of the largest juvenile schools in Boston.[23]

The trouble started immediately after the election when the Boston City Solicitor, a Mr. Healy, issued a legal opinion stating that the City Charter and the Statutes of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts denied women the legal right to serve on school boards.[24] According to Mr. Healy's opinion, citizens were only eligible to hold those public offices for which they could legally vote; and since women did not have school suffrage in Massachusetts, they were ineligible to hold school offices.

Although it was never clear whether or not the City Solicitor's opinion was binding upon the actions of the School Committee, the members of the school board were obviously influenced by it when it came time to vote upon seating the ladies. In a close ballot, the four board positions to which the women had been elected were denied them.

According to all accounts, public opinion in Boston was greatly aroused by this action. Citizens of the wards in which the women had been elected held protest meetings where they charged that the action of the school board was "ill-considered, unjust, injurious to the educational interests of the city, and especially wrong to those wards which have chosen to be represented by the ladies."[25] Those who sided with the schoolboard, characterized by the opposition as being "old conservative fellows who wear stand-up collars" confined their arguments to the "purely legal aspects of the case."[26] Because of the outcry, the school committee decided to take a second vote upon the question of seating the women. This time the ballot went more heavily against the ladies.

The women immediately applied to the Massachusetts Supreme Court for a mandamus to secure their seats on the school board.[27] Entering petitions which stated that they had met all the qualifications for the office of school committee prescribed by law, the women claimed that the school board had no justification for imposing or requiring additional qualifications for the office such as one based on sex. The Supreme Court accepted this argument and granted their petitions.

Despite this Supreme Court ruling, the women were to receive another set back when they again attempted to take their seats on the school committee. This time, the City Solicitor issued an opinion stating that since the women had twice been denied their seats by a vote of the schoolboard and since the school commissioners alone, not the courts, had the power to decide upon all questions relative to the "qualification, election, and return of their members,"[28] the women were still ineligible to serve. Again, the women applied to the Supreme Court for redress, but this time the judges sided with the City Solicitor and dismissed their petition.

The battle for the Boston school board, however, was not lost. State Senator Fitzgerald, a strong supporter of the women's position, declared that the Supreme Court had dodged the real issue, by ruling on a technicality, and introduced a bill into the Massachusetts Legislature providing "that sex shall not disqualify a person from serving on school committees."[29] This bill met with little opposition and became law in 1874.[30] Five years later, in 1879, this same legislative body was to grant school suffrage to women, thus making Massachusetts one of the first states to permit women to vote in school elections.

In 1875, Abbie May, Lucia Peabody, and Lucretia Crocker again ran and were elected to the Boston School Committee.[31] This time there were no questions raised about their eligibility to serve in this capacity and they proceeded to take their seats on the school board. Unfortunately, Mrs. Adeline Badger, the fourth woman who had been elected and refused her seat two years earliers, was no longer alive to share in this triumph. Perhaps succumbing to the emotional strain caused by the well publicized controversy, Mrs. Badger "jumped overboard from a steamer in Long Island Sound" and was never seen again.[32]

Although the battles for school governance by women in Chicago and Boston differed in regard to details and intensity, in both situations the parties to the consensus on school governance by women and the opponents to this feminine cause were the same. In both cities, the fight was led by socially prominent, economically elite women who felt that their position and sex entitled them to greater control over public education. They based their arguments on claims that it was appropriate, practical and desirable for them to serve on school boards. Female principals and teachers supported them in this effort because they seemed to believe that their professional interests would be better served by women board members than by men. Local newspapers and many prominent men also supported the cause of school governance by women in these cities most probably because of the prominence of the women involved and also the less than radical nature of their demands.

The visible opposition to the appointment of school-board women in both cities consisted of city politicians and conservative businessmen. Using arguments based on legality, propriety and political expediency, this opposition was able to slow the movement for female school

governance in their cities but not stop it.

With Boston and Chicago leading the way, other major battles to initiate school governance by women in America were soon fought and won. By 1892, school offices and school suffrage for women was achieved, under varying conditions, in most states.[33]

The affect of women school board members upon public school policy should be studied in greater depth than allowed by the scope of this paper. However, a review of late nineteenth-early twentieth century journals and newspapers reveal four major categories of school policy in which women seemed to have an immediate and favorable impact. These included school financing, the school curriculum, compulsory school legislation, and teacher benefits.

In the area of school financing, many sources agree that the efforts of interested women proved very effective in helping to pass school bond issues. In various states across the country, the votes of women helped to erect new school buildings and to raise money for other school improvements. For example, according to the Wisconsin Superintendent of Schools in 1908, the city of Madison owed its new high school entirely to the efforts of its female voters.[34]

Female school board members played a major role in expanding the school curriculum to include courses in manual arts for boys and in domestic science for girls. Some examples of specific contributions in this area included the following. Mrs. Ellen Mitchell, first school-board woman in Chicago, was responsible for proposing the reforms which led to the reorganization of the Chicago Manual Training School.[35] Miss Lucy Flower, who replaced Mrs. Mitchell on the Chicago Board in 1891, was responsible for the introduction of sewing classes into the schools.[36] Mrs. Grace H. Dodge, the first woman school commissioner of New York City, helped to get cooking classes incorporated into the New York school curriculum.[37]

Female school board members were also helpful in pushing for the establishment of kindergartens.[38] The first kindergartens were introduced by interested women into the St. Louis public schools in the 1880's.[39] Once women began to serve on school boards, many of them tried to make kindergartens a standard feature in their public school systems.

Female school board members also seemed to share a deep commitment to compulsory school legislation. Between 1888 and 1898 the first six women to sit on the Chicago school board all served on the Compulsory Education Committee.[40] They also worked closely with the Chicago Woman's Club in pushing for the passage of a compulsory education bill for Illinois. According to one member of the Chicago Woman's Club, the first compulsory school law that was passed in Illinois was written by members of the club. She publicly accused

Governor John Altgeld of hypocrisy for claiming credit for this accomplishment.[41]

In the area of teacher's benefits, school governance by women also seemed to have a favorable impact. One such effect was increased mobility for women within the school structure; although, in the first instance, such mobility resulted from attempts to stem the growth of school governance by women as in the case of Ella Flagg Young and Lizzie Hartney in Chicago. To some degree, school-board women also tried to improve the general working conditions of teachers. Once such effort in Chicago involved the successful attempt to alter an absurd school policy which required "all the teachers in twenty-five square miles of territory to come to one office on the minute to get their pay."[42]

Evidence also suggests that school-board women and female voters did try to exercise the kind of female consciousness hoped for by women teachers and principals when they had supported the movement for school governance by women. Such considerations seemed to be present in the minds of female voters in Kansas in a 1903 school election when they voted to eliminate existing provisions in teacher contracts which restricted female teachers from receiving "attention and calls from their admirers" during the school term and which also required the "forfeiture of a portion of their salaries" if the women married before the end of their terms.[43]

The impact of school goverance by women upon the movement for universal female suffrage at the turn of the century, was not nearly so immediate or so favorable as it had been upon school policy. Some aspects of the participation of women in school governance even seemed to jeopardize the successful passage of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution.

The principal problem was low voter turn out among women. According to estimates made at the turn of the century, less than four per cent of the women eligible to vote in school elections actually did so.[44] This low voting average among women provided a rallying point for the opponents of female suffrage throughout the nation. They claimed that women had demonstrated that they were not really interested in having the franchise and thus they didn't deserve it. The following manifesto which was circulated in 1895 by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of the Suffrage of Women tries to make this point:[45]

> We find tangible proof that the women of this state do not desire the ballot in their general indifference to school suffrage, which has failed to rouse their zeal and interest during the many years of its existence.

A similar anti-feminist group in Ohio made an even stronger statement on this subject when it said:[46]

> School suffrage...has been a lamentable failure...In the State of Ohio the number of women responding to the privilege has been so small, and the expense of registering and counting it has been so relatively large, that it has been seriously proposed to withdraw it altogether.

Many feminists became alarmed by this kind of unfavorable publicity. Some of them issued statements begging their sisters to register and vote in school elections. The State Suffrage Association of New York earnestly appealed to all women in 1897 when it wrote: "Do not let this right be taken from you. It was gained by a hard struggle."[47]

Despite this problem, the historical significance of school governance by women for the feminist movement in America seems positive. The opportunity to serve on school boards and vote in school elections marked the female debut into the American political process and was the proving ground for the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution. The following story, which explains Theodore Roosevelt's reasons for supporting the nineteenth amendment, illustrates in a more direct way the strong historical connection between school governance by women and the successful passage of the female suffrage amendment to the Constitution.

According to this anecdote, Theodore Roosevelt, in this first gubernatorial address to the New York Legislature, recommended that women be granted the right to vote. This comment caused quite a stir among the audience, and after his address was over, reporters flocked to Roosevelt with questions concerning his reasons for promoting female suffrage. He told them, among other things, that his hometown of Oyster Bay had long been in need of a new schoolhouse. But those concerned about education had never been able to get the town to make the necessary appropriation for one until women were given a vote on school questions. Then, he said, the mothers immediately went to the polls and voted to erect a new schoolhouse.[48]

If Roosevelt's story highlights the importance of the achievement of female school governance for women and for education in the past, it is ironic to note that a current assessment of the achievement of female participation in school governance for women and schools today is not nearly so encouraging.

To begin with, many of the curricular changes which were introduced into the schools by female board members in the late nineteenth century, and which persist today, are considered reactionary and unnecessarily sexist by today's standards. Such courses as domestic science for girls and mechanical arts for boys, are primary targets for charges of discrimination by the leaders of the Woman's Liberation Movement.

It also seems possible to suggest that the predominantly upper-middle class origins of the first school-board women tended to make them rather conservative. Generally speaking, on most school policy decisions the positions of early school-board women seemed indistinguishable in nature from those of the men with whom they served. The elevated status of these women probably made it difficult for them to think of little girls as potential breadwinners who might have to compete in a man's world or to identify with the predominantly working class needs of the feminine teaching force. No doubt, this kept them from exercising the kind of leadership in feminist areas which their positions on school boards might have made possible. Even today, the less than radical nature of the women who run for school board positions is reflected in the kind of slogans they choose to represent them. One recent campaign slogan was "We Need A Mother On The School Board."[49]

Also from a political point of view, women never seemed to be able to consolidate their gains in the area of school government and for the past eighty years have tended to remain a rather insignificant minority on most school boards. A recent survey conducted in this area indicates that only 11.9 per cent of the school board members in America are women.[50] And, unfortunately, this is the highest the percentage has ever been. Such discouraging statistics tend to suggest that the election and appointment of school-board women has only been a form of tokenism.

While this paper has only skimmed the surface of the history of school governance by women in America, it nevertheless suggests certain lessons for those who wish to achieve greater involvement by women in political decision making today.

To begin with, feminine activists should not expect to accomplish revolutionary changes in our society merely by appointing or electing more women to positions of political authority. For many women do not share the activist point of view and will not necessarily use their positions to exercise feminist leadership. Additionally, the number of political issues in the United States which have an identifiable feminine dimension may be as limited as those issues which appeared in the area of educational policy at the turn of the century.

Finally, women must be extremely cautious when they choose the issues on which to assert a feminist point of view. Such positions may ultimately backfire upon the very cause which women are trying to promote. Such appears to be the case in the current reaction against the domestic science classes which were introduced into the curriculum by the first school-board women.

Because of its unique position in serving as the introduction for women into the American political process, it can be assumed that a deeper study of school governance by women will reveal other lessons to help women in their struggle to attain full political participation in

today's society.

NOTES

[1] See discussion in Kay Hodes Kamin, "She Could Always Teach," *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society*, 1 (1973), 26-28.

[2] *Chicago Tribune*, May 20, 1887, p. 9.

[3] Thomas Woody, *A History of Women's Education in the United States*, 2 Vols. (New York: The Science Press, 1929) I, 462.

[4] *Chicago Tribune*, May 20, 1887, p. 9.

[5] *Chicago Tribune*, June 8, 1890, p. 12.

[6] Woody, p. 499.

[7] *Intelligence*, VI (December 15, 1886) p. 237.

[8] H. G. Frank A. H. Jerome, *Annals Chicago Woman's Club 1876-1916*, (Chicago: Libby Co., 1916) p. 17.

[9] *Intelligence*, IV (June 15, 1884), p. 180.

[10] *Chicago Tribune*, June 14, 1877, p. 4.

[11] *Intelligence*, VII (June 15, 1887) p. 141.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Chicago Tribune*, May 20, 1887, p. 9.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] *Chicago Tribune*, June 26, 1877, p. 8.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Chicago Tribune*, June 8, 1890, p. 12.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] Frank and Jerome, p. 67.

[20] *Chicago Tribune*, May 22, 1887, p. 4.

[21] *Chicago Tribune*, June 26, 1888, p. 4.

[22] *Chicago Tribune*, February 2, 1874, p. 4.

[23] *Chicago Tribune*, December 27, 1873, p. 4.

[24] *New York Times*, December 25, 1873, p. 1.

[25] *New York Times*, February 23, 1874, p. 5.

[26] *Chicago Tribune*, January 29, 1874, p. 4.

[27] *New York Times*, March 16, 1874, p. 1.

[28] *New York Times*, June 30, 1874, p. 1.

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] *Intelligence*, VII (January 1, 1887) p. 9.

[31] *New York Times*, October 14, 1874, p. 5.

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] By 1892 the following states had some form of school governance by women: California, Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Wisconsin, and the territories of Arizona, Washington, and Wyoming.

[34] Alice Stone Blackwell, *Women and the School Vote* (Boston: E. L. Grimes Co., 1911) p. 3.

[35] *Chicago Tribune*, August 23, 1890, p. 4.

[36] Frank and Jerome, p. 93.

[37] *Godey's Lady Book*, CXV (July, 1887) p. 51.

[38] *Chicago Tribune*, April 23, 1882, p. 4.

[39] *Chicago Tribune*, March 3, 1882, p. 4.

[40] Chicago, *Annual Reports Board of Education*, 1881-1901.

[41] *Chicago Tribune*, November 8, 1892, p. 4.

[42] *Intelligence*, IX (January 15, 1889) p. 21.

[43] *New York Times*, September 27, 1903, p. 13.

[44] Caroline F. Corbin, *A Protest Against the Granting of Municipal Suffrage to Women*, (Chicago: Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, 1906) p. 3.

[45] *New York Times*, September 24, 1895, p. 14.

[46] Illinois Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, "Facts and Fallacies About Woman Suffrage," March, 1911, p. 1.

[47] *New York Times*, June 6, 1897, p. 14.

[48] Blackwell, p. 1.

[49] Marian Thompson, *Summary Report of the National School Board Association Commission on the Role of Women in Educational Governance*, March 29, 1974, p. 3.

[50] Carolyn Mullins, "The Plight of the Boardwoman," *American School Board Journal*, 159 (February, 1972) p. 28.

TWO TREATMENTS OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCE:

DEWEY ON NATIONALISM and KALLEN ON PLURALISM

Jay Wissot
California State College
San Bernardino, California

At the center of all efforts to manifest the pluralist ideal in this country is the historic tension between two forces: the need of individuals and groups to express their natural diversity balanced against the need of the modern nation-state to maintain a political and economic unity. This paper focuses on one element in that historical tension, the role of ethnicity as either a barrier or gateway for the growth of the individual and the development of the society.

I will argue that John Dewey's view of ethnic boundaries as barriers to those ends reflected a fundamental predisposition towards cultural nationalism. I will attempt to prove that Horace Kallen in his view of ethnic boundaries as gateways to those ends presented a classic statement on cultural pluralism. I trust given the litany of now familiar educational proposals calling for community control, ethnic studies and bilingual/bicultural curriculums the value of this topic will seem obvious.

In 1903 Dewey wrote "Life proposes to maintain at all hazards the unity of its process. Experience insists on being itself securing integrity even through and by means of conflict."[1] And in a footnote reflecting back to that statement he noted,

> 'Professor James' satisfaction in the contemplation of bare pluralism of disconnection, of radical having-nothing-to-do-with-one-another, is a case in point. The satisfaction points to an aesthetic attitude in which the brute diversity becomes itself one interesting object; and thus unity asserts itself in its own denial. When discords are hard and stubborn, and intellectual and practical unification are far to seek, nothing is commoner than the device of securing the needed unity by recourse to an emotion which feeds on the very brute variety. Religion and art and romantic affection are full of examples."[2]

Dewey wrote James an apologetic letter shortly afterwards and asked the man to whom the book, Studies in Logical Theory, was dedicated "to overlook the disrespectful allusion to your pluralism in a footnote."[3] Added Dewey: "I can but feel that your plurality as it now stands is aesthetic rather than logical."[4] He went on to explain in another letter the reasons for his personal dissatisfaction with James's pluralism suggesting that "it may be the contrived working of the Hegelian bacillus of reconciliation of contradictions in me, that makes

me feel as if the conception of process gives a basis for uniting the truths of pluralism and monism, and also of necessity and spontaneity."[5]

Dewey's reaction to the radical empiricism or pluralism of James is significant for two reasons. First, it reveals Dewey's conclusions, however erroneous they may have been, regarding the substantive limitations of James's pluralism. James, in his latter writings,[6] made it quite clear that radical empiricism was not an extension of British empiricism and that recognition would be paid to both conjunctive and disjunctive relations. And second, it provides insight into the philosophic objective, "uniting the truths of pluralism and monism", that Dewey, at a formative point in his career, sought to achieve. A disposition to search for a greater order of ultimate unity in the universe, to reconcile the distinctive features of oneness and manyness present in existence, was alien to the thought of both James and Kallen.

Dewey was nurtured in the idealism of T. H. Green and G. S. Morris, both vigorously opposed to laissez-faire individualism,[7] and committed to the progressive social engineering side of nineteenth century Darwinism. He was quite distinguishable from James with respect to the uses of scientific intelligence for the resolution of modern urban and industrial problems. Clarence Karier has noted that "James loved humanity from the perspective of Harvard Yard and Dewey from the perspective of Jane Addams' Hull House. James' radical empiricism was a philosophy of individualism, not of social action."[8]

While Dewey did defend James's contributions to philosophy from social critics unsympathetic with the general thought of pragmatism,[9] he wanted his own version of pragmatism, instrumentalism, kept clearly distinct from the more romantic and aesthetic strains present in James's thought.[10] Dewey paid tribute and admiration to the promise of a Jamesian universe in which "uncertainty, choice, hypotheses, novelties and possibilities"[11] were all present in naturalized abundance. But, as he was not hesitant to point out, the demands and dimensions of an urban and industrial society called for a "later form of pragmatism,"[12] one more capable of applying the instruments of natural science, technology and the "logical intellect of mind"[13] towards the humanization of modern existence.

Two broad historical traditions exist for viewing the social assimilation of the immigrant in the United States. The first and more ethnocentric tradition is commonly referred to as Anglo-conformity.[14] Exponents of Anglo-conformity viewed the droves of Southern and Eastern European immigrants entering the country between 1880 and 1920 as a serious menace to the maintenance of established Anglo-Saxon standards for public and private conduct. The goal of the Anglo-conformists, immigrant restriction policies failing, was to break up the isolated immigrant colonies, assimilate the adult members and "implant in their children", as one follower put it, "the Anglo-Saxon

conception of righteousness, law and order and popular government...."[15]

The second and more liberal tradition[16] posited the idea of a created common culture towards which each group could contribute the distinctive values and characteristics of its respective heritage, the dominant Anglo-Saxon tradition being reduced at the formation stage to a one among many. Overly zealous proponents of the common culture idea reduced its meaning to the simplified and popular image of a catch all "melting pot." They ignored the process features a gradual blending of different cultures implied and like their Anglo-conformity counter-parts engaged in the most absurd of "overnight" assimilation practices.[17]

More thoughtful and reflective advocates of a common culture position like Dewey and Jane Addams avoided use of the "melting pot" rhetoric and couched their proposals in the softer and more enlightened language of shared cultural contributions.[18] The point worth noting here is that the differences between the extremists and the moderates were more a matter of method than substance. In this regard I urge that a distinction be clearly drawn between a desire to preserve the cultural values of a group and a desire to preserve the cultural group. The rhetoric of cultural contributionism could support the instrumental value of the former position but contained no ground for the latter. I agree, therefore, and will show why shortly, with Seymour Itzkoff when he, for different reasons, says: "Dewey implied that the plural society does not exist as an end in itself. Rather it is the best social arrangement for leading us on to more changes ad infinitum."[19]

Dewey's articles on assimilation reveal a positive concern over the harmful social effects produced by the zealous intention to rapidly assimilate the multiple ethnic groups and a negative concern over the tendency on the part of ethnic enclaves to remain isolated and separate from the larger social community. Dewey explained the first concern when he added his opinion to the growing alarm that immigrant children were being "too rapidly de-nationalized", losing in the process "the positive and conservative value of their own native traditions, their own native music, art and literature" and learning to despise "the dress, bearing, habits, language, and beliefs of their parents -- many of which have more substance and worth than the superficial putting-on of the newly adopted habits."[20]

In his "Nationalizing Education" address before the National Education Association in 1916, a frequently quoted source for his views on assimilation, Dewey reiterated his aversion to rapid assimilation and carefully avoided identification with the Anglo-conformist point of view. He criticized the zealots "who talk the loudest about the need of a supreme and unified Americanism of spirit" implying that "they really mean some special code or tradition to which they happen to be attacht (sic)."[21] Dewey charged that those who measure "the scope of Americanism by some single element which

enters into it" were "themselves false to the spirit of America."[22]

In presenting his own view on a more desirable assimilation practice, Dewey expressed the hopes and fears of the common culturists who sought an intelligent, peaceful resolution to the general controversy. The hope, as Dewey saw it, rested with a policy of "extracting from each people its special good so that it shall surrender into a common fund of wisdom and experience what it especially has to contribute."[23] "All of these surrenders and contributions taken together," noted Dewey, "create the national spirit of America."[24]

Dewey's paramount concern was not with the preservation of ethnic cultures but with the instrumental value ethnicity served in the construction of a greater national culture. Towards that end Dewey stressed the fact that ethnic pride for the individual was predicated on the nature and merit of his group's contribution to the society. Pointing to the objective for teaching about immigrant contributions in American History classes, Dewey said: "When every pupil recognizes all the factors which have gone into our being, he will continue to prize and reverence that coming from his own past, but he will think of it as honored in being simply one factor in forming a whole nobler and finer than itself."[26]

That Dewey viewed the ethnic group as a barrier to the growth of the individual and the general welfare of the society is substantiated in Democracy and Education. "A democracy," Dewey said, "is more than a form of government; it is primarily a form of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity."[27]

In the interest of breaking down the restrictions of birth and social circumstance, Dewey assigned a significant role to the public school. As Dewey explained: "It is the office of the school environment to balance the various elements in the social environment, and to see to it that each individual gets an opportunity to escape from the limitations of the social group in which he was born, and to come into living contact with a broader environment...."[28] According to Dewey the school's purpose was to "provide something like a homogeneous and balanced environment for the young."[29] "Only in this way," he said, "can the centrifugal forces set up by the juxtaposition of different groups within one and the same political unit be counteracted."[30] Any consideration of Dewey's interest in the preservation of ethnic cultures is obligated to explain why Dewey would want to protect and maintain communal associations he clearly viewed as restrictive for its members and disintegrative for the society and from whom the public schools offered a viable means of personal escape and social control.

Shortly after Horace Kallen published his earliest and most comprehensive statement on cultural pluralism,[31] Dewey wrote him and expressed his reservations regarding the tenor and direction of Kallen's views on culture and assimilation. Dewey recalled:

> "I never did care for the melting pot metaphor, but genuine assimilation to one another -- not to Anglo-saxondom -- seems to be essential to an America. That each cultural section should maintain its distinctive literary and artistic traditions seems to me most desirable, but in order that it might have the more to contribute to others. I am not sure you mean more than this, but there seems to be an implication of segregation, geographical and otherwise. That we should recognize the segregation that undoubtedly exists is requisite, but in order that it may not be fastened upon us." [32]

What disturbed Dewey most about Kallen's position was the hint of justification for cultural separatism and the absence of a clear commitment to the formation of a "genuine" national community. On both grounds Dewey was essentially correct.

Kallen, a student of William James's at Harvard and editor of James's posthumously published work, Some Problems in Philosophy, shared his mentor's commitment to the principles of radical empiricism.[33] Four years after James's death Kallen wrote: "There is neither monism nor dualism nor alteration of two orders. There are just terms and relations, conjunctive and disjunctive. The multiverse is discrete and radically plural. Reality is externally related."[34]

Kallen demonstrated a greater willingness than was apparently present in Dewey to appreciate and accept the aesthetic and metaphysical unity through diversity description of a pluralistic universe. There was no omnipresent urge in Kallen to search for the great community or practice the brand of social engineering associated with Dewey. The general movement to reconstruct the immigrant landscape of the United States was foreign to Kallen's social thought. It sharply conflicted with the convictions he held regarding the internal integrity and communal sufficiency of the various ethnic enclaves.

Kallen's position on cultural pluralism created a new ground for assimilation dialogue. Unlike the rapid and gradual assimilationists, Kallen was not convinced that assimilation was either inevitable or desirable.[35] In distinct contrast to the prevalent tone of inevitability and desirability found in the assimilation literature, Kallen wrote:

> "What is inalienable in the life of mankind is its intrinsic positive quality – its psycho-physical inheritance. Men may change their clothes, their politics, their wives, their religions, their philosophies, to a greater or lesser extent; they cannot change their grandfathers. Jews or Poles or Anglo-Saxons, in order to cease being Jews or Poles or Anglo-Saxons, would have to cease

to be, while they could cease to be citizens or church members or carpenters or lawyers without ceasing to be. The selfhood which is inalienable in them, and for the realization of which they require "inalienable" liberty is ancestrally determined, and the happiness which they pursue has its form implied in ancestral endowment."[36]

In order to understand the significance of this last quoted passage a comparison and contrast of Kallen and Dewey's views on individual to group identity relations is needed. Both Kallen and Dewey shared in the thought of the early social psychology movement established in this country by figures like Charles Horton Cooley, George Herbert Mead, Albion Small and Edward Alsworth Ross. The movement turned to the significance of group attachment and association in order to explain the development of personality and psychological growth in the individual. For them, the individual and the group existed in a state of inseparable relationship to one another. The individual could not be identified save through reference to a containing social group; the social group could not be understood save through reference to its contributory members. The two were reciprocally bound and inextricably connected. Dewey said: "The individual in his isolation is nothing. Only in and through an absorption of the aims and meaning of organized institutions does he attain personality."[37] Kallen stated: "The very conception of the individual himself has changed. He is seen no longer as an absolute and distinct entity, but as a link in an endless historic chain which is heredity, and as a point in a geographical extent involving political, economic, social organization, and all other factors of group life, which are his environment."[38]

But Dewey parted company with Kallen over the latter's insistence on attaching a primal significance and almost determinative influence in the attainment of self realization to the ties of race and nationality. Kallen was in fact resoundly accused of racial and cultural determinism and years later admitted to a strain of biological determinism in his early writing."[39] the closest he came to clarifying the issues his critics raised was when he said: "each man or woman is the intersection of a line of ancestry and a line of social and cultural patterns and institutions, and it is what we are by heredity and early family influence that comes nearest to being inalienable and unalterable."[40]

Dewey never denied the historical significance of primary group ties, what Cooley referred to as "face to face" relationships,[41] in the formation of personality and character in the individual and the social integration of local associations. "In its deepest and richest sense," Dewey said, "a community must always remain a matter of face-to-face intercourse. This is why the family and neighborhood, with all their deficiencies, have always been the chief agencies of nurture, the means by which dispositions are stably formed and ideas acquired which laid hold on the roots of character."[42]

Dewey held, however, that the local communities were no longer capable of managing their own affairs because the "new technology applied in production and commerce resulted in a social revolution."[43] As Dewey described it: "The local communities without intent or forecast found their affairs conditioned by remote and invisible organizations. The scope of the latter's activities was so vast and their impact upon face-to-face associations so pervasive and unremitting that it is no exaggeration to speak of "a new age of human relations." The Great Society created by steam and electricity may be a society, but it is no community. The invasion of the community by the new and relatively impersonal and mechanical modes of combined human behavior is the outstanding fact of modern life."[44]

Dewey recognized a clear danger and cause for social alarm in the consequent breakdown of local community authority and purpose. "Evils which are uncritically and indiscriminately laid at the door of industrialism and democracy might, with greater intelligence," said Dewey, "be referred to the dislocation and unsettlement of local communities."[45] The task of the "Great Community, in the sense of free and full intercommunication...," would be to order the relations and enrich the experiences of the instable, disintegrated and restless local communities.[46]

Where Dewey saw instability and disorder in the communal groups, Kallen found sufficiency and strength. Where Dewey saw communal boundaries as barriers to social adjustment, Kallen viewed them as gateways. Kallen referred to the immigrant's institutions as the heroes in his adjustment to the American scene.[47] He explained the process as follows: "Disjoined from the old ways and values and not yet at home in the new, he becomes demoralized. Just in so far as he can live and move and have his being in the groupings of his own people he is saved, however, from the consequences of his demoralization. The groupings are his organs of contact with the new social milieu. They speak his language and convey his ideas; they speak the language of the land and communicate its moods. They are the intermediaries between him and it. They carry him over and ultimately they adjust him."[48]

Kallen believed that the philosophic problem of the "one and the many" applied to society could be satisfactorily answered through the cooperative relationships established by political and economic institutions, representing the "one," and multiple ethnic communities, representing the "many." While his view did not preclude the practice of cultural contact and cultural sharing across ethnic boundaries,[49] it did envision permanent lines of communal distinctiveness. The key idea for Kallen was "self realization through perfection of men according to their kind."[50] Given operational form, the individual would be in a position to "move without strain, and with satisfaction, from one to another of the many and multiplying organizations of interests whereof the culture of his country consists, without having to become "acculturated" to the different and "deculturated" from the same of

his primal commitment and allegiance."[51]

In 1924 Kallen provided a clear outline for what he hoped would be the alternative to cultural nationalism.

> "Its form would be that of the federal republic: its substance a democracy of nationalities, cooperating voluntarily and autonomously through common institutions in the enterprise of self-realization through the perfection of men according to their kind. The common language of the commonwealth, the language of its great tradition, would be English, but each nationality would have for its emotional and involuntary life its own peculiar dialect of speech, its own individual and inevitable esthetic and intellectual forms. The political and economic life of the commonwealth is a single unit and serves as the foundation and background for the realization of the distinctive individuality of each "natio" that composes it and the pooling of these in a harmony above them all."[52]

Kallen's last public reflection on the possible direction of ethnic existence in American society appeared in a 1930 essay. There he repeated his earlier proposal saying that "the spiritual future of America is best thought of in analogy with Great Britain or Switzerland, each of which is one commonwealth with many nationalities and cultural enclaves."[53] The intervening years have not, for reasons too numerous and complex to detail here, been kind to Kallen's social vision. What we have witnessed, however, is the fulfillment of a social expectation far more in line with Dewey's nationalism than with Kallen's pluralism. One sociologist termed it the "liberal expectancy" and described it as "the expectation that the kind of features which distinguish one group from another would inevitably lose their weight and sharpness in modern and modernizing societies, that there would be increasing emphasis on achievement rather than ascription, that common systems of education and communication would wipe out group differences, that nationally uniform economic and political systems would have the same effect."[54]

Thomas F. Green sounded a comparable theme eight years ago when he questioned the compatibility of an open, meritocratic society and a diverse, plural society. Green said at the time: "I would like to suggest in the strongest possible way that what we have seen happening in the United States is not the growth of a plural society, but the growth of an open society, in which the criteria for determining status are less and less connected with ethnic origins and more and more connected with achievement and that this development may mitigate against pluralism."[55]

Any future resurrections of pluralism as a social ideal will have to face up to the contours and confines of a technocratic and meritocratic ruling order and still prophesize the creation of a society in which even a modicum of political liberty, social equality and cultural plurality fit and contribute to the pleasure of each other's company.

NOTES

[1] John Dewey, *Studies in Logical Theory* (Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1903), p. 81.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Letter from Dewey to James, March, 1903, in Ralph Barton Perry, *The Thought and Character of William James* (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1948), p. 306.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*.. p. 307.

[6] See, for example, *Essays in Radical Empricism and A Pluralistic Universe*, ed. Ralph Barton Perry (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1971), pp. 23-29; *Pragmatism and Other Essays* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1963), pp. 57-72.

[7] Morton White, *Pragmatism and the American Mind* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 196.

[8] Clarence Karier, *Man, Society and Education* (Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Co., 1967), p. 136.

[9] John Dewey, *Characters and Events* (New York: Holt and Co., 1929), vol. 2, pp. 435-442.

[10] Morton White, *Social Thought in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957), pp. 142-145.

[11] Dewey, *Characters and Events*, p. 440.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.*.. p. 441.

[14] Milton Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 84-114.

[15] *Ibid.*.. p. 98.

[16] John Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, (New York: Atheneum Press, 1971), pp. 250-251.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 248.

[18] Dewey said: "The Theory of Melting Pot always gave me rather a pang. To maintain that all the constituent elements, geographical, racial and cultural in the United States should be put in the same pot and turned into a uniform and unchanging product is distasteful." "The Principle of Nationality," *The Menorah Journal* (October, 1917), p. 206.

[19] Seymour Itzkoff, *Cultural Pluralism and American Education* (Scranton, Penna.: International Textbook Co., 1969), p. 60.

[20] John Dewey, "The School as Social Center," *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association* (1902), p. 374.

[21] John Dewey, "Nationalizing Education," *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association* (1916), p. 184.

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 185.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 185-186.

[27] John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916), p. 101.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Horace M. Kallen, "Democracy Versus the Melting Pot," *Nation* 100 (18 and 25 February 1915).

[32] Letter in J. Christopher Eisele, "John Dewey's Position on the Treatment of Immigrants," paper presented at The History of Education Society meeting in Atlanta, Georgia on November 15, 1974. Letter appeared on page nine of the paper.

[33] Sidney Ratner,"Some Central Themes in Horace Kallen's Philosophy," in *Vision and Action*, ed. Sidney Ratner (New Brunswick: Rutgers U. Press, 1953), pp. 83-111.

[34] Horace M. Kallen, "James, Bergson and Traditional Metaphysics," *Mind* 23 (1914), p. 231.

[35] Horace M. Kallen, *Culture and Democracy in the United States* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1924), p. 169.

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 122-123.

[37] Dewey, *Democracy*, p. 94.

[38] Kallen, *Culture*, p. 59.

[39] Gordon, *Assimilation*, pp. 150-151.

[40] Kallen, *Culture*, p. 60.

[41] John Dewey, *the Public and Its Problems* (Chicago: Swallow Press, 1954), p. 97.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 211-212.

[47] Kallen, *Culture*, p. 161.

[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 161-162.

[49] Horace M.Kallen, *Cultural Pluralism and the Critical Issues in Jewish Education* (New York: Farband-Labor Zionist Order, 1964), pp. 12-13.

[50] Kallen, *Culture*, p. 121.

[51] Horace M. Kallen, *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea* (Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press, 1956), p. 53.

[52] Kallen, *Culture*, p. 124.

[53] Horace M. Kallen, *Indecency and the Seven Arts* (New York: Liveright, 1930), p. 90.

[54] Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, "Why Ethnicity," *Commentary* (October, 1974), p. 33.

[55] Thomas F. Green, *Education and Pluralism: Ideal and Reality* (Syracuse: Syracuse University School of Education, 1966), p. 25.

Harold Rugg: EDUCATOR IN SEARCH FOR THE AUTHENTIC GESTURE

Robert V. Bullough, Jr., University Fellow
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Paper presented at Midwest History of Education Society, Loyola University of Chicago, October 24, 1975.

Preface

A number of prominent educational thinkers have commented upon the ahistorical nature of the educational field (Bellack, Cremin, Kliebard). Their writings clearly demonstrate that much work needs to be done in uncovering and interpreting our past. Santayana's warning continues to haunt us: "He that ignores the lessons of history is doomed to repeat its mistakes." To talk of future possibilities, as many educators do, while ignoring the past is foolhardy. We must begin, as Harold Rugg suggests, with the history of ideas which, of all the foundations of education, "is prior and fundamental in building a theory."[1] Among the areas of historical study that have been neglected is that associated with early curriculum thinkers. This essay investigates the writings of one such thinker, Harold Rugg.

The Search

Harold Rugg, like his friend Isadora Duncan, spent his life searching for that one "authentic gesture." His efforts led him to a concern for creating a world within which authentic gestures might be at home, a world of freedom, peace, tolerance, design and creative imagination. This search took him from the active pursuit of normative science at the University of Chicago to an artists' colony at Woodstock, New York. To trace the development of his thinking throughout his forty-five year professional journey is beyond the scope of the paper. I shall instead briefly describe only his thinking in relation to two rather large areas of concern: (1) the condition of American culture and its destiny, and (2) the nature of an education capable of meeting the American challenge, an education with a crucial role to play in shaping America's destiny.

America

Rugg called our present era a time of "great breathing space,"[2] a period in which America finds herself at the "crossroads to a new epoch." What was to come would essentially be a matter of her choosing which road she would take. Many roads would lead to social chaos. But one road, he felt, would lead to "the era of the Great Society. There is no way to short-circuit the building of this new epoch. There is only the way of education, and its great purpose is THAT MEN MAY UNDERSTAND."[3]

But to bring about understanding requires that men must engage in critical investigation and evaluation of the culture. Rugg's efforts in this area are well known to students of the Progressive Era. His analysis and criticism cut deep into the perennial problems of democratic-cooperative living. He ignores many of the more superficial, but perhaps most often asked, questions about technique (how do I do something) to ask questions about the very principles upon which the culture rests. He studied what he considered to be the works of a rising generation of original American social thinkers, Thorsten Veblen, Frederick Jackson Turner, "Uncle Charlie" Beard, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Ruth Benedict and Franz Boas. These critics, working around the turn of the century, were creating new ways of looking at the phenomena of America. Rugg's concern was to bring this thinking to bear on education, for he saw these efforts as "new" sources of foundations for education. With this body of knowledge to shed light on what was and is America, Rugg attempted to sort out what he considered to be the critical cultural problems of this nation.

Using Ruth Benedict's concept of "Cultural Patterns," Rugg identified five trends in American thinking that were (are) particularly anathema to the creation of the Great Society. First, he observed that cultural decisions are left to the "casual current of events." The American has an undying faith that everything will be all right. If something serious should happen, somehow, perhaps almost by magic, usually the magic of some distantly sensed scientific expert, everything will work out. This persistent, but naive, faith was seriously challenged by the depression but survived.

Secondly, and perhaps the most dangerous cultural pattern, is the belief in "laissez-faire," that all too American belief that everybody has a right to get all they can as best they can. The idea is that in competition, the best man will win, and his winning will be best for all concerned. It perpetuates the myth that the "good life" can come through competition, through free-enterprise. Although speaking in the 1940s, Rugg's concern has potency today.

Thirdly, Rugg points to our society's aversion to social planning. Only in crisis situations is any serious thinking done about planning, and then it is to plan our way out of something. In his "infamous" Bode lecture at The Ohio State University (July 1951), Rugg made the statement that he was hoping for another depression because only in a crisis situation do people stop to ask "why?"

Fourth, and related to the others, is a faith that in dangerous times, enough people will be aware of the situation and take steps to "restore the balance" that everything will work out for the best.

And finally, he mentions that we leave our economic and social security to the "vagaries of competition."[4] This is an especially significant issue in Rugg's thinking. He states that our system

guarantees political and civil freedoms but not economic or social freedoms. Even today, our social freedoms are far from complete (witness the civil rights movements and other movements of liberation). He goes on to state that economic freedom is prior in importance to other freedoms "for it provides the implementation of the others."[5] This is a pivitol issue for our civilization, one which limits our progress toward the "good life." He firmly believed that a system of competition, wherein individuals do not or cannot cooperate, is severely limited in its abilities to foster democratic living. In a laissez-faire system, wealth is concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. Wealth brings power. Concentrations of power. Power, Rugg believed, should ultimately reside in the people, and this among other things, requires that they have some property. "Ownership, widely disseminated, gives all the people a personal stake in the nation, its problems and conditions; it prods them to study and keep alert, to vote and share in government. It is the surest way to relocate legitimate power in the individual men and women of the nation."[6]

He looked, perhaps naively, toward government as the one agency powerful enough to mediate, as a disinterested party, between (labor) individuals and business. Through cooperation, through planning, a world of abundance, both physical and spiritual, could be created. Rugg pointed with pride to the Tennessee Valley Authority as an excellent example in support of his contention.

These cultural patterns that grew out of a slow moving agrarian civilization that was America were, in fact, functional at one time. They helped create a very powerful, dynamic nation. But, with the advent of the "second industrial" or technological revolution, society was dramatically changed. Thoughtful observers found, as did Rugg himself, that "home, school, and community had not only failed to build understanding and a sense of values but had actually worked against their development."[7] The system had changed and the values of individuals lagged far behind.

William Ogburn, a man Rugg held in high esteem, coined the phrase "cultural lag" to describe this phenomenon. In The Great Technology, Rugg uses this concept suggesting that "(1) economic productivity . . . had far outstripped (2) social invention, especially that ability of society through cooperation of its leaders of government, business and agriculture to regulate and control the direction and extent of economic productivity. But (3) popular consent, that is, the ability of our people to carry on government on the principle of intelligent understanding of the governed–had dropped far behind both the others."[8] This condition left (leaves) individuals confused, bewildered, frustrated. In current psycho-sociological terms, they were "powerless." Rugg saw this condition as the chief threat to American democracy.

During such times of stress, not unlike our present era, unusual

reactions are likely to occur. For example, Rugg speaks of the Red Scare during 1919-1920 when the nation was hit by a number of strikes (Boston Police Strike) and other powerful economic problems that followed the Armistice. Another form of reaction is also very likely to occur, the kind precipitated by super-patroits. Among these, he identifies the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, and any number of groups who believe that there is only one way, an answer, and that they have it. "They are the unAmericans because the American really thinks that each man and woman in the society and each child should make his contribution to the decision. That means that there must be more than one side."[9] The famous Rugg textbooks were the victims of just such a super-patriotic reaction.

Education

The solutions to the pressing problems created by cultural lag were to be found in education, an education that would bring about social cooperation--the resolution of the "I" and the "We" as Rugg called it. This was an education which would bring forth the creative energies of each individual. In probing the nature of such an education, Rugg once again turned to a number of frontier thinkers--a grouping he eventually came to call the "Men of the Consensus." These were those who participated in the "Creative Way" as opposed to the "Conforming Way." They were creating a more complete understanding of man and society.

Because this knowledge was not organized and easily available, in his belief that we know enough to build the "schools of tomorrow" today, Rugg set for himself the task of synthesizing what proved to be fantastic amounts of knowledge in a wide variety of fields. His Foundations of American Education is such an attempt. He organized this knowledge into what he called the four foundations of education: (1) a new bio-psychology, (2) a new sociology, (3) esthetics, and finally (4) ethics. His attempt was to take the "facts" from these areas, synthesize them, and generate a solid foundation upon which to build a "new" education that would answer the challenges of contemporary living. "The central concepts of the sociology and the esthetics (would) govern the content of the program of studies; the concepts of the psychology (would) determine the curriculum organization and teaching; the concept of the ethics (would) guide the climate of freedom and discipline and set the code of behavior for the life of the school."[10]

The "facts" contained in these areas would, if understood, lead to correct action--cooperative action. It was simply a matter of letting the "facts of life conclude."[11] The goals, then, of this new education would be to present the facts (or make it possible to discover them) about man and his culture.

Rugg, as he viewed these "facts," suggested that a shift in cultural

values could be discerned. This shift can best be understood in terms of his concept of cultural progress.[12] He suggests that a culture goes through three stages of development. First is a period of imported values. This is a time when a culture gets its standards, its poetry, music, dress, and values from another culture, usually from its mother culture. Secondly, there is a period of rebellion against these standards. And thirdly is a period of transition or original native forms of expression. This shift of values, as presented in the thinking of the Men of the Consensus, represents a movement into the third period of development. In his Bode lecture, Rugg suggested several components of this shift, among them are:

A shift from

- concern with things, to the relation between things
- passive conformity to active participation
- statics to dynamics
- substance to function
- part to whole--this must be the new conception
- laissez-faire to control
- individual to the group
- inequality to equality
- centralization to decentralization
- integration to disintegration and back to integration

These shifts, from the old cultural patterns to new ones, represent Rugg's view of the values that will emerge (should emerge) from our period of transition providing, of course, that our democracy is preserved and extended. He sees these as natural to the organism and as natural (and necessary) to cooperative living. The works of the Men of Consensus contained the the facts which to Rugg suggested this conclusion.

Rugg was interested in the creation of a larger "consensus." His participation in a bi-monthly discussion group at Teachers College (which eventually became the John Dewey Society) for some 15 years lent support to this belief. From these discussions came a surprising consensus as to what America needed to do, what changes were necessary and a willingness to work for their implementation. Through study and discussion came consensus; through rational inquiry. Supposedly, they let the facts conclude along the way. If the entire culture could participate in such "study-groups," perhaps a similar consensus could be created.

71

In 1933, through the auspices of a committee on adult education of the Progressive Education Association, he made a "systematic proposal for nationwide adult study of the economic situation and the preparation of study materials" for this purpose. His plan was to involve thousands of local branches of national citizen groups in adult education–a form of "democratic group process." This organization would have had a "national clearinghouse in New York City, with regional and state offices stimulating and co-ordinating the work through the country."[13] Through such an organization, the culture could make considerable progress toward the creation of "education-centered communities." This is the progressive dream at its best. Nothing became of this proposal, but it does represent an important part of Rugg's thinking.

As early as 1923, Rugg was formulating the proposal that problems of American life should be the basis of the curriculum. Efforts connected with this belief thrust him into the forefront of the incipient social-studies movement. He wanted controversy brought into the classroom. He wanted students to grapple with the difficult and perplexing issues of the day. He wanted them to analyze critically and thoughtfully their culture and to reflect on life. And, he wanted to bring creativity, spontaneity and intuition into this entire process. But controversy in the classrooms? This had not been done. Why, it was positively "unAmerican!" He had a great deal of faith in the ability of persons to make good decisions if they had the facts. He did not believe, however, that all persons would be far enough along in their personal understandings to do so but felt that a committed minority could show the way. Obviously, the "facts" were not being presented. Rugg created his textbooks to help correct his situation. The hope of our civilization rests with such efforts to get at and use the facts. Through this study would come a realization of the need to "design" our future progress.

The Men of the Consensus provided the foundations for theory. The people's task was then, besides that of setting policy, to implement, along with the help of technologists, the design. Theory–Design–Building. Theory and policy going hand-in-hand. This was his hope. He believed that only through educating a "large body of Americans to understand American life" thereby fostering "in them an energetic fighting spirit to make it an abundant life" could democracy be preserved.[14] Education was to build an active democracy, one capable and willing to take leadership in a world struggling to produce an abundant life.

The recreation of the society was a major concern. But he stressed that although solving the major social problems of the economic-political system is of great import, this should not monopolize the energy of the American people. "I think they should

work equally hard at the job of creating a society in which each individual can live as a person, in which each can state himself for his own soul's sake, as completely and as well as he can."[15] To do this requires the involvement of the whole person--both mind and body; both the inner and outer worlds.

This recognition of the relationship between the individual's inner and outer worlds is perhaps Rugg's most important contribution to progressivism. He, with but a few others, most often artists with only passing interest in education, kept alive that part of the early progressive movement that concerned itself with esthetics, with imagination. He studied widely and deeply into the act of creation. His work took him from Eastern studies into an attempt to point out the way to a "Tao of the West."[16] Rugg realized that the problems of our age, the problems keeping us from living richly, require that the entire organism be brought into play, that the whole organism find opportunities for expression. He realized that there needed to be a new study of experience and of behavior in order to more fully understand the creative experience. He called for a removal of the gap between the scientific and the intuitive ways of knowing, a gap that he apparently had personally bridged. And, so stressed the importance of expression and appreciation in living richly. He felt that only through esthetics could a person become "integrated." And he was convinced that this changing of self was closely connected with the improvement of the culture.

To tap this world of imagination, Rugg calls for artist-teachers who are masters of expression in at least one medium and who are sensitive to the presence of creative capacity in others and skilled in the techniques of drawing out and developing it. Called for were teachers who are masters of feeling and concept. These complete persons, who as students of America possess a deep and rich understanding of others and of the cultural forces they must contend with, are the keys to discovering ways of freeing imagination. In free imagination and understanding through intuition as well as through science rest our hopes for the abundant life--a democratic life.

But where are the artist-teachers? Rugg suggests that they are caught up in the "Ways of Conformity" and therefore cannot be expected to take their rightful places of leadership. His book, the Teacher of Teachers, is written partially to help bring "awareness" to his colleagues of this condition and to attempt to awaken them so they will remember their destiny. He stated that he is not sure there is time enough to accomplish what must be done--but he believed so. We must begin with our areas of competence--ourselves and the schools--where we have our most impact. Teachers can and will take the lead (an assumption which reminds one of some of the recent pleas of the neo-romantics). Teachers must begin by bringing themselves together. By meeting, much as the early Teacher's College group did, to discuss issues, to design and implement--a form of "democratic group process"--the culture can be recreated. Finally, he suggests that his generation had

spent itself and that hope now is with the young. "The job ahead is yours."[17]

Conclusion

No short paper could do justice to the richness of Harold Rugg's thinking. He was, like all men, a product of his times, a visionary, a dreamer, an inveterate worker for a new social order. He died still working to bring understanding to his fellow human beings–the same persons who, twenty-five years before, had thrown his textbooks out of the schools without ever reading them. We may view many of his ideas as naive, even somewhat simple-minded, but much of his thinking has importance for our present educational-cultural situation. From his criticisms of the early progressive schools contained in his (and Ann Shumaker's) Child-centered Schools to his concern for creation and the act of creating as expressed in his final work, Imagination, published after his death, one finds a storehouse of useful, interesting, and important scholarship. Together, these works provide a rich resource that should be explored by individuals seeking to build solid historical foundations for the study of education as a field in inquiry.

NOTES

[1] Harold O. Rugg, *Teacher of Teachers* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Pub., 1952), p. 152.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[3] Harold O. Rugg, *That Men May Understand* (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1941), p. 350.

[4] Harold O. Rugg, *Foundations for American Education* (New York: World Book Co., 1947), pp. 341-45.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 367.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 678.

[7] Rugg, *That Men May Understand*, p. 172.

[8] Rugg, *Foundations for American Education*, p. 309.

[9] Harold Rugg interviewed by I. Keith Tyler, The Ohio State University, recorded July 15, 1951.

[10] Rugg, *Foundations for American Education*, p. 654.

[11] Report on the Bode Conference held July 10-11, 1951, at The Ohio State University.

[12] Rugg, *That Men May Understand*, p. 333.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 148.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 329.

[16] Harold O. Rugg, *Imagination* (New York: Harper and Row, Pub., 1963), Chapter 10.

[17] Rugg, *Teacher of Teachers*, p. 273.

PART II

EDITORS SUPPLEMENT

THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, A PRODUCT OF REFORM VALUES, 1890-1920

W. Richard Stephens, Academic Dean
Professor of Education and History
Greenville College, Greenville, Illinois

A paper presented at the Midwest History of Education Society at Chicago, Illinois, October 27-28, 1967.

It is difficult to describe the system of education in America inasmuch as there is not now, nor has there ever been, a single national system. There are as many different systems of education in America as there are states and cities, and so the common attributes they share is primarily a function of extra-legal, nationwide agencies such as the National Education Association (NEA), accrediting agencies, commercial textbook and test publishers, and the like. This heterogeneity makes it particularly difficult to say when and under what conditions some educational program became a part of the American system, and the junior high school is but one example of this problem.

The junior high school is a vital part of American education and is often an arena of conflict regarding what its purposes, curriculum, methodology, and organization should be. Antagonists often appeal to what they presume it "has always been," its history, in order to support their proposals. It behooves us, therefore, to be as informed as possible about its history; not because we think we will find some inherent truth progressively working itself out into an ideal institution, but in order to learn what lessons there are for us, thus, to be more intelligent in choosing its future course.

The effort of this paper, therefore, will be to describe briefly some of the social conditions out of which the junior high school emerged around the turn of this century. It will be argued that the junior high school emerged in early twentieth century America not as a result of the child study movement as some have argued, but primarily as a result of progressive reform forces which operated primarily outside of the legal structure of education, and honored the values of social and economic efficiency. And it will be further argued that these values emerged in the schools in the form of practical education for vocational efficiency.

The Era of College Domination: By mid-nineteenth century the idea of an eight year elementary school had been developed and was well on its way to becoming a reality in various states. Its major purpose was the development of an enlightened citizenry which, it was argued, was necessary for the continued progress of a republican government based upon democratic values. It did not offer vocational courses in its curriculum, but emphasized the intellectual skills necessary for literacy and computation.

Paralleling in several states the development of the elementary school, but not attached to it, was another public institution of three or four years length. It was variously called a high school, seminary, "peoples college" and in some cases an academy--not to be confused, however, with the private academy. The purposes of the high school were the preparation of older boys, fourteen to eighteen, for civic and vocational competence, and in some cases admission to one of the classical liberal arts colleges. But by 1880 the college preparatory goal became dominant in most of the high schools. It was not until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, however, that the high school became legally tax supported, and it was not until the second decade of the twentieth century that it would be considered as an extension upward of the elementary school.

By 1890 the high school had grown so spasmadically, and in such numbers, that it was becoming a problem for college admissions officers who were unable to tell what kind of education the high school certificate reflected. The high schools often varied greatly in the number of courses they offered, the amount of time allocated for teaching them, the number of years required for graduation, faculty training and the like. As a result colleges were unable to tell whether or not graduation from a high school qualified one for admission to college.[1]

Not only were colleges concerned about the lack of standardization of the high school, but industrial and business leaders were also concerned about its alleged overly academic curriculum, which seemed to make it irrelevant to their needs for industrial skills. Agriculturalists and laborers were also demanding that the high school prepare their students for more vocational efficiency. And political leaders, sensing the rising pulse beat for more practical and efficient education to meet the growing social problems, began to criticize the academic high school. This reform sentiment would build to a peak in the first decade of the twentieth century and move the nation's progressive President, Theodore Roosevelt, to say, "Our school system is gravely defective in so far as it puts a premium upon mere literacy training and tends, therefore, to train the boy away from the farm and the workshop."[2]

In 1892 the NEA responded to these demands for a standardized high school, one that would better prepare its graduates for admission to college and for practical life.[3] President Charles Eliot of Harvard, who was identified with more than 200 organized reform groups, was made chairman of a Committee of Ten college oriented scholars whose purpose was to reorganize the high school curriculum. In 1893 the Committee proposed a four-year high school elective curriculum comprised of four programs of study: Classical, Latin-Scientific, Modern Languages, and English.[4]

The Committee was vigorously criticized because these courses of study did not contain any strictly vocational subjects even though some

non-classical subjects were added such as English, history, modern languages, and the modern physical and biological sciences. In short, all four courses of study are college preparatory in that they all required a mastery of academic studies. However, the Committee did make an innovative recommendation which is important for understanding the structural beginnings of the junior high school. What was the recommendation and what values could have legitimized it?

It was during the time when the factory was beginning to serve as a model for getting things produced faster, more efficiently and economically that Eliot proposed in two addresses, one in 1888 and one in 1892, that the elementary schools be both "shortened" and "enriched."[5] Eliot was clearly concerned about the upward trend in the age at which freshmen were being admitted to college, and so he proposed that the "waste of time" in the elementary school be reduced two years in order to begin the students' college preparation sooner. The Committee of Ten gave evidence that it accepted Eliot's shortened, enriched, and economized thesis by recommending that either the elementary school begin to teach "several subjects now reserved for high schools-such as algebra, geometry, natural science, and foreign languages," or "the secondary school period should be made to begin two years earlier than at present, leaving six years instead of eight for the elementary school period." The Committee went on to say that "elementary subjects and elementary methods are . . . kept in use too long."[6] It was argued that putting high school courses in the grammar grades would more adequately introduce the student to the high school, honor the values of efficiency and economy, and begin preparation for college earlier. As two scholars of the junior high school recently observed, "It is in this recommended framework that the organizational beginning of the junior high school is seriously suggests."[7]

A negative response to the Committee of Ten's proposal that the seventh and eighth grades departmentalize and begin to teach college preparatory courses was made by the NEA elementary education Committee of Fifteen in 1895.[8] It was the last NEA committee to recommend an eight year elementary school. However, the direction of reform in America through economy and efficiency would not be diverted by this recommendation and during the next decade, 1895-1905, many elementary and secondary schools were reorganized into two six year units.

The NEA Committee on College Entrance Requirements, appointed in 1896 and reporting in 1899, sanctioned the proposals of Eliot's Committee by urging that the "seventh and eighth grades" be made "parts of the high school under the immediate direction of the high school principal."[9] This Committee clearly continued the Committee of Ten's emphases on early preparation for college admission and efficiency. It also probably reflected the growing influence of the child study movement by arguing that the "seventh grade rather than the ninth, is the natural turning point in the pupil's life."[10] However, the organization and development of curriculum, based not on the

disciplines but on the child's nature and social needs, would not become dominant in American education until about 1918.[11]

Thus far, the argument has been advanced that American educational leaders during the 1890's were stirred to committee action: (1) by the problems of time and articulation between the various organizational units, (2) by the forces of an infant reform movement which were beginning to respond to the dissolution of an agrarian society and the problems of city growth and immigration,[12] and (3) by the emerging criteria for reform--economy and efficiency. As an example of the kinds of changes that some schools were making, most likely in response to these forces and committee recommendations, it is instructive to look at Richmond, Indiana. This is one of several cities which is often cited for having developed the first junior high school, and since it also becomes important to our study later on the reorganizations brought about there will be described briefly.

The Richmond reforms in educational organization were made in 1896 and even though some students assert that the nation's first junior high school resulted, it did not actually go by that name. The newly created organizational unit was merely called the "Garfield School: Grades Seven and Eight." Gilbert Morrison, who was chairman of the NEA Committee on Six-Year Course of Study, stated in his third report for this Committee in 1909 that the Richmond school was in fact a six-year high school.[13] Morrison's assertion is corroborated by the fact that the Richmond reorganization resulted in high school courses being pushed down into grades seven and eight, a move which would certainly reduce the alleged waste in the elementary school. More specifically, the principal of the Richmond school reported that the departmental plan was introduced and "The curriculum was vitalized by the introduction of modified algebra, modified English, . . . and a more rigorous course in United States history." Elective choice could be made among Latin, French, English, music, art, and practical arts, available to both boys and girls. Subject specialists, promotion by subject, and organization into homerooms with faculty advisers further characterized the school.[14] This reorganization is clearly consistent with the 1893 recommendation of Eliot's Committee and the subsequent recommendation of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements. It seems evident that it was also a response to the mechanisms of reform--economy and efficiency. But, was it a junior high school? It seems warranted to conclude that it was only in the sense that it mirrored the high school in its curriculum, organization, purpose, and teaching pattern. Further, it was half as long as the high school, lower in status, had younger students, and was, therefore, since identical in kind, its junior. However, the Richmond school was not a junior high school as that designation was understood in 1916 when it was reorganized again into a three year unit.

Several other cities followed Richmond in effecting the 6-6 pattern of reorganization and the conservative college preparatory curriculum.[15] By 1915, however, the seventh and eighth grades in many of these six-year high schools would become separate organizational units. Also, these intermediate units as they were frequently called, would change their purposes and rationale in response to more powerful forces of reform. To the dynamics and particulars of this process we will now turn our attention in the remainder of this paper.

The Era of Social Reform: It has been pointed out that educational reforms from 1892 to 1905 were essentially reorganizations of the structure of education. To be sure some curricular modifications were made by including some courses in the physical and life sciences. But from 1905 to 1918 educational reforms would again be urged not only in the structure of education but more radically in its substance. America would increasingly feel the unanticipated negative social effects of the industrial movement and progressives would urge that the schools be reformed in order to curb these effects. Lawrence Cremin has commented succinctly on the variety of voices that demanded a reform of the schools so that they could help reform society.

> Business men and labor unions were insisting that the school assume the classical functions of apprenticeship. Settlement workers and municipal reformers were vigorously urging instruction in hygiene, domestic science, manual arts, and child care. Patriots of every stripe were calling for Americanization programs. And agrarian publicists were pressing for a new sort of training for country life that would give youngsters a sense of the joys and possibilities of farming. . . . The common implication running through these proposals is that educational functions traditionally carried on by family, neighborhood, or shop are no longer being performed; somehow they must get done; like it or not, the school must take them on.[16]

An important direction, for understanding the emergence of the junior high school, that this reform impulse took was a clamor for industrial and agricultural vocational education and a decrease in what President Roosevelt called "mere literacy training." The slogan around which this movement rallied was "social efficiency."[17]

Several educators added their voices to the cry for more vocational education as a result of their studies of school dropouts and retardation. E. L. Thorndike and George Strayer had made such studies, but Susan Kingsbury's and Leonard Ayers' were cited more often in the reform literature. It was argued by critics that the academic high school of the Committee of Ten, and the traditional elementary school were producing too many repeaters and dropouts who were ill-prepared for successful employment. In 1905, Kingsbury's study for the Massachusetts Douglas Commission reported finding 25,000 dropouts from the upper elementary grades. Her study was frequently referred to

by the reformers and, according to Krug, it "laid the groundwork for the later advocacy of differentiated courses of study in the seventh and eighth grades."[18] In 1908, Leonard Ayers a prototype of the efficiency expert, not only documented the high dropout and retardation rate of the elementary school, and blamed it on the academic curriculum by charging that it was "fitted not to the slow child or the average child but to the unusually bright one,"[19] but he also translated these data, using an "Index of Efficiency," into dollars and cents. Ayers, then ignoring the overcrowded classes, poorly trained teachers, and the heterogeneous student body, told the cost-conscious public that their schools were inefficient to the tune of "about twenty-seven millions of dollars in our cities alone."[20] Raymond Callahan cogently argues that:

> Ayers' book, together with the . . . dominance of businessmen and the acceptance of business values (especially the concern for efficiency and economy); the . . . critical, cost-conscious, reform-minded public, led by profit-seeking journals; the alleged mismanagement of all American institutions; [strongly influenced] school administrators who were already under constant pressure to make education more practical in order to serve a business society better . . . .[21]

Reform Sentiment Organizes--the NSPIE: In 1907 the findings of these dropout studies and the sentiment of reformers to vocationalize the schools resulted in the formation of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (NSPIE). This organization was a polyglot of progressive reformers, including bankers, industrialists, and labor leaders, which sensitized the nation to the "need" for industrial education and set as one of its chief purposes the adaptation of "public education to the real needs of American youth . . . ."[22] That it achieved its goal is evidenced by its role in the drafting and passage of the Smith-Hughes Bill, 1917, and is a matter of record. That it significantly contributed to the development of the junior high school is demonstrable if less well known.

However, before the NSPIE could achieve any of its educational reforms it had to work out its own internal problems. These problems had to do: (1) with determining the adequacy of private trade schools, which were generally favored by the industrial wing of the organization and opposed by the labor wing, (2) with developing a new type of general and industrial education that would be effective in reducing the alleged economic inefficiency and waste of the old school as well as make the student a more socially efficient worker, and (3) with developing effective extra-legal methods of working to bring about changes in the public schools commensurate with its goals.

Founding members of the NSPIE had watched the economic success of Germany and were inspired, on the one hand to fear her as a competitor for world markets, and on the other to use her as a model for educational reform. Vice-President of the National City Bank of New York, Frank A. Vanderlip, who was also a member of the first Board of Managers of the NSPIE, expressed this sentiment as follows:

> I have had a somewhat unusual opportunity to study the underlying causes of the economic success of Germany, and I am firmly convinced that the explanation of that progress can be encompassed in a single word--schoolmaster. He is the great corner-stone of Germany's remarkable commercial and industrial success.[23]

Vanderlip was but one of some 250 other reformers representing industry, labor, public and private education and social work, who gathered at the first meeting of the Society in Chicago, in 1908. They heard Charles Eliot in the opening address refer to Susan Kingsbury's study of 25,000 school drop outs and the peril in which this placed the nation. As a remedy Eliot urged that the NSPIE actively promote the development of "industrial schools . . . for children from fourteen to seventeen . . . years of age." "Teachers of the elementary schools" he urged, "ought to sort the pupils . . . by their evident or probable destinies."[24] Anticipating that he would be charged with being anti-democratic, Eliot argued that nature had destined inequality among the gifts of men and that democracy only required providing a set of conditions which "enables every individual to put forth his utmost effort."[25]

Eliot, departing from his faculty psychology based proposals in 1893, clearly called for a dual system of public education which would include "trade schools . . . distinct from the existing public schools." However, the NSPIE eschewed this advice, accepted Jane Addams proposal of a single public and comprehensive system, and had set by 1910 as one of its four major goals, "To adapt" the existing system of "public education to the real needs of American youth, nine-tenths of whom take up, directly or indirectly, industrial careers."[26] This goal was not arrived at easily but was the result of much debate at the first three conventions between manufacturers arguing for the establishment of trade schools and labor leaders arguing for reforming the public schools.

Three more goals emerged as the Society received encouragement from hundreds who echoed the sentiment of President Roosevelt, that "Our school system has hitherto been well-nigh wholly lacking on the side of industrial training and this is a most serious lack . . . ."[27] These goals were:

> To provide men capable of meeting modern demands of manufacture, and to enable the United States to compete in the markets of the world.
>
> To provide training under the specialized conditions of modern manufacture which will be the equivalent to the training formerly given by apprenticeship.

> To give boys and girls a broad familiarity with industrial processes, which will open to them a wide range of useful employments.[28]

By 1910 it was clear that the NSPIE would work to modify the existing public school system to make it more productive of social and industrial efficiency, and not lend its efforts to the development of a dual system of trade and academic schools. However, subsequent meetings of the NSPIE would feature occasionally addresses on the subject, but increasingly the Society would give its attention to the means of actualizing its goals. Finally, to settle the issue once and for all John Dewey was invited to the NSPIE to speak on the wisdom of developing a dual system of public trade and academic schools. He told the audience that "absolutely to divorce the movement for vocational education from existing educational instrumentalities and put it under separate control is a measure of absolutely last resort, a measure of desperation."[29] After this the question was hardly raised at subsequent meetings.

To some in the Society, however, it seemed that nothing had been achieved in the way of concrete educational reorganization of the existing public schools to include opportunities for industrial education. No one expressed this criticism more clearly and effectively than did Jesse D. Burks of the Bureau of Municipal Research of Philadelphia. Convinced, as municipal researchers were that cities could be reformed through the application of scientific research, Burks urged at the 1909, December, meeting at Milwaukee that the NSPIE adopt a scientific approach to realizing its goals.[30] In pointing out the failure of the manual training propaganda to make itself widely and substantially effective," Burks noted that only one-half of "thirteen hundred city school systems in the United States" had "introduced, somewhere in their curriculum . . . hand-work or manual training."[31] He urged that the "striking discrepancy between ideas and achievement" be reduced first, by scientifically surveying school systems to gather facts and, secondly, on the basis of such facts proceed to implementing "a safe, progressive and rational program of industrial education."[32]

Burks' idea of doing scientific surveys was not specifically mentioned at the 1910 meeting in Boston. Rather James P. Munroe, president of the NSPIE and treasurer of the Munroe Felt and Paper Company, continued the rhetoric regarding Germany's successes, and repeated the argument that if industrial education was put in the schools, America, given its "Yankee gumption, ought to progress in the next forty years very far and very fast."[33] In addition, the treasurer of the Society reported receiving three $1,000 gifts, one each from Andrew Carnegie, V. Everiot Moy, and Frederic Pratt of Standard Oil, and reported a membership of 1,306, an increase of over 1,000 in five years.[34] David Snedden's Committee on National Legislation also reported at this meeting that some progress had been made with Senator Carroll Page in drafting a vocational education bill. And, sensing that its passage would pave the way for the NSPIE to partially actualize its goals, Snedden

urged that the "time had arrived" for the Society, in the interest of "economy and efficiency," to make "a candid examination of the whole question" of the relationship of the public schools to industrial education. That this was no idle suggestion is clearly indicated by the actions of the reformers during the coming months.

At the November, 1911, NSPIE meeting in Cincinnati there was a decidedly different sentiment than that which Burks had observed at previous meetings. There was an urgency to pursue the Society's goals by implementing the two routes of reform that had been emerging in previous meetings: (1) continue to work for national and state vocational education legislation, under the leadership of Snedden and Prosser, and (2) conduct educational and industrial surveys, the mechanism urged by Burks two years earlier.[35]

The urgency to act had been a persistent theme of the progressive reformers, but its quickening between the 1910 and 1911 meetings resulted from both an increased criticism of the economic inefficiency of the administration of the schools, and the appearance of Frederick Taylor's Principles of Scientific Management.[36] Taylor came forth in this book arguing that his principles could be demonstrated to produce efficiency and economy in every area of life and urged that they be "applied with equal force to all social activities: to the management of our homes; the management of our farms; the management of the business of our tradesmen, large and small; of our churches, our philanthropic institutions, our universities, and our governmental departments."[37] The muckrake journals--McClures, Saturday Evening Post, Outlook, and Ladies Home Journal--shifted their attacks to the social and economic inefficiency of the schools in 1911 and 1912 and urged the application of Taylor's system to their adminstration.[38]

Soon the professional educational journals were featuring articles by such leaders as Frank Spaulding, Franklin Bobbitt, and Ellwood Cubberly urging the application of scientific management to education.[39] For example, Spaulding urged the use of the dollar as a criterion for judging the efficiency of both the administration of the schools and the relevance of their content of study. He described how he had been using this criterion since 1904 in his schools at Newton, Massachusetts. "Academic discussion of educational values," he told an NEA audience, "is as futile as it is fascinating. Which is more valuable, a course in Latin or a course in machine shop?" Spaulding answered that when he found that more "pupil-recitations in English for a dollar" could be had than "Greek" he decided to "purchase no more Greek instruction."[40]

Clearly, by the end of 1911 the stage was set for the NSPIE to make its move in concrete ways. On the one hand it would step up its work for national and state vocational education legislation, and on the other hand it would follow the principles of scientific management, using the dollar criterion, in sponsoring educational and industrial surveys of selected states and cities. It was evident that vulnerable administrators

would cooperate in the industrialization of their schools, both in their conceptions of administration and in their curriculums and purposes. All the NSPIE needed was for one of its leaders to provide the impetus to move by rationalizing the plea for scientific management and dollar based decision-making with industrial education and a plan of action.

Rallying to this challenge at the November 1911 meeting of the NSPIE was James Munroe, its president and a leading industrialist from Boston. He began his address by arguing that including industrial education throughout the elementary schools, with an increasing emphasis on it for the fourteen to sixteen year olds, could certainly reduce "the inconceivable waste of our human resources." He further argued that the "effect of industrial education upon the general welfare, the direct effect in increasing industrial efficiency and prosperity, and the indirect influence in diminishing the number of incompetents, unfortunates and other social wrecks and burdens, would be so great as literally to reform our industrial and social structure." "What the community wants . . . of schooling is efficiency," and he urged "every good citizen . . . to join the NSPIE . . . in order that you and they and we may keep down the present awful waste of our vast human resources."[41]

The next question was how to get the public schools to reorganize for teaching more industrial education. Munroe had been writing a book about this which would appear the following year, 1912. Echoing Burks' idea he called for applying the mechanism of the educational and industrial survey under the direction of an "educational engineer." "What is to be done," he asked, "about the colossal and needless waste of human energy?" He answered,

> What every other business does when it finds itself confronted with possible bankruptcy through preventable waste, losses, and inferiority of output. It calls in engineering and commercial experts to locate causes and to suggest reforms. We need 'educational engineers' to study this huge business of preparing youth for life, to find out where it is good, where it is wasteful, where it is out of touch with modern requirements, where and why its output fails; and to make report in such form and with such weight of evidence that the most conventional teacher and the most indifferent citizen must pay heed.
>
> Such engineers would make a thorough study of (1) the pupils who constitute the raw material of the business in education; (2) the building and other facilities for teaching, which make up the plant; (3) the school boards and the teaching staff, who correspond to the directorate and the working force; (4) the means and methods of instruction and development; (5) the demands of society in general and of industry in particular upon boys and girls--this corresponding to the problem of markets; and (6) the question of the cost, which is almost purely a business problem.[42]

The Society now had its plans rationalized and operationalized, and since it was being successful in its work at the level of national and state legislation[43] it was ready to move into various school systems and survey their program, find them inefficient and out of touch with the needs of industrial society, and reorganize them with industrial education at their centers. That Munroe's plans were more than presidential rhetoric will become clear when the Richmond, Indiana, survey is described.

Educators Respond to NSPIE Power: During this period that the NSPIE was working out its internal problems and developing its plans, its annual meetings were interspersed with numerous reports of "experiments" in teaching vocational skills to the fourteen to sixteen year olds. In fact, these reported experimental educational units became models by which the NSPIE survey teams worked in making their proposals for educational reforms. For examples, Charles DeGarmo had advocated developing a "junior industrial high school" for this age group.[44] At the 1910 NSPIE meeting L. O. Harvey, Superintendent of Schools in Menomonie, Wisconsin, urged "more experiments" with the "intermediate industrial school" for the fourteen to sixteen year olds. He pointed out that the typical "trade school . . . is not the intermediate industrial school," and urged that industrial education be provided for in the grammar grades with the existing public school system.[45] At the same meeting Superintendent William H. Elson of Cleveland described with enthusiasm an experiment with an "intermediate industrial school" for fourteen to sixteen year olds in his system. He said that he "modified the curriculum from the usual literacy course for seventh and eighth grades" and added "shop work" for boys and "household arts" for girls.[46]

Also in 1910 Superintendent Frank Bunker of Berkeley, California, developed a similar school, reputedly known as the first junior high school, out of grades seven through nine and called it an "introductory high school." Bunker described in detail the kinds of charges he made in the school's organization and purpose and the reasons for the changes. He alluded briefly to the characteristics of adolescence and the need for a more "gradual transition" between the elementary school and the world of work.[47] However, among the more pressing reasons cited by Bunker for the reorganization were "congestion at the central schools owing to the growth of the city,"[48] "limited playground" space,[49] and improved "scholarship" at the lower and intermediate levels due to competition for promotion to succeeding levels.[50] Further, Bunker cited as justifications for the reorganization the Ayers, Strayer, and Thorndike studies of retardation and dropouts among the fourteen to sixteen year old youth. Bunker blamed the dropouts of the Berkeley schools on an overly academic curriculum and concluded that the occupational needs of these students required "radically changing the nature and the content of the course of study."[51] He described in detail the vocationalizing of the content of study in the Berkeley school: he put "type-writing in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades, bookkeeping and stenography in the eight and ninth, and commercial law and 'elementary banking' in the ninth. Along with the special

subjects, work in penmanship, in history, in geography, in manual training or domestic science, in drawing, in music was continued." Further "To compete with the business-school interest," academic courses were modified to "'business arithmetic' and 'business English."' The remaining academic courses were made optional for the few students who would go on to the upper high school.[52] Finally, Bunker had learned from the Ayers study that the dropouts meant not only social inefficiency but also economic inefficiency, so he argued that the reorganization of the "upper grades of the grammar schools" was the "only arrangement" that could be made "within reasonable limits of expense."[53] This economic motive was also evident to the editor of the Educational Review when he commented on the Berkeley reorganization as follows: "Superintendent Bunker proposes a reorganization and a re-grouping of the several grades of the schools in the interest both of economy and of educational efficiency."[54]

Clearly these changes of both the substance and structure of the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades evidence the impact of the reform mechanism of social and economic efficiency as espoused by the NSPIE. That these changes were not limited to Berkeley, California, is evidenced by the fact that eleven superintendents reported in 1912 that they had reorganized grades seven, eight, and nine into separate units.[55] Also, during the next two years over one hundred and fifty city superintendents reorganized their grammar grades into junior high schools.[56]

It is instructive, for further understanding the relation of social and economic efficiency to the emergence of the junior high, to look more specifically than we have thus far at the role of the NSPIE in its efforts on the state and local level. As has been pointed out the Society not only "propagandized" the nation into an awareness of its "needs" for vocationalizing its public schools, it also became directly involved in reorganizing them. The specific mechanism by which the Society became involved was the school and industrial survey. In 1914, Leonard Ayers directed the first survey sponsored by the NSPIE for the schools and industries of Richmond, Virginia. Ayers focused on the fourteen to sixteen year old dropouts and the relation of the curriculum of the schools to the needs of local industries. The pattern of conducting the Richmond survey was followed by Charles Prosser as he directed the Minneapolis survey in 1915; superintendent of schools Frank Spaulding, who was also an active member of the NSPIE, had requested the Society's sponsorship of the survey in April, 1915.[57] In both of these surveys the Society recommended that the curriculum of the schools, especially for the grammar grades, be "industrialized" to prepare the fourteen to sixteen year old youth for employment.

Inasmuch as we have already noted the junior high type of reorganization which took place at Richmond, Indiana, in 1896, and in view of the fact that the NSPIE sponsored the 1916 survey of its schools and industries, it will sharpen our understanding of the role of the NSPIE to look at its activities there.

In 1913, Indiana passed its Vocational Education Law. The law came out of the Indiana State Commission on Industrial and Agricultural Education whose secretary John A. Lapp was a leader in the NSPIE. Lapp reported to an NSPIE convention that the bill "reported by the commission had been enacted into law in the form proposed . . . with scarcely a dissenting vote."[58] After this law was passed Governor Ralston appointed to the State Board of Education Mr. P. A. Reid, who was a leading industrialist and secretary of the Elliott Reid Company of Richmond. Reid's appointment was made "on the basis of his interest in vocational education."[59] Inasmuch as Reid was a member of the Richmond Board of Education, his "enthusiasm for the newer (vocational) types of education was directly focused upon the Richmond situation."[60] State Superintendent Charles Greathouse observed that Richmond Superintendent J. T. Giles "supported by the board of education" led Richmond to the "conscious realization that the schools bore a direct responsibility for the training of boys and girls for industry, commerce, agriculture, and the household arts which," he said, "as yet had been but partly discharged."[61]

In May, 1915, the Richmond board contracted Professor Robert Leonard, an active member of the NSPIE and recently appointed professor of vocational education at Indiana University by W. L. Bryan, to direct the survey of its schools and industries. This was the first of what the NSPIE referred to as its "Indiana Surveys." The NSPIE "was invited . . . and urged to take a prominent part" in making the surveys, not only of Richmond, but also of Evansville and Indianapolis. Superintendent Greathouse reported that "the Secretary of the National Society and two members of its Survey Committee, C. R. Richards and C. A. Prosser, were appointed on the Indiana State Survey Committee, Dr. Prosser being made Chairman of the Committee."[62] The Richmond board gave the Survey Committee a blank check by "obligating itself to carry out the recommendations for vocational education made by the State Board of Education . . . as rapidly as possible."[63]

It will be recalled that Richmond effected a reorganization of its schools in 1896; the grammar grades, seven and eight, were separated from the elementary school and made more academic in their purposes. The general purpose of the 1916 survey, however, was radically different: it was to "outline an efficient and economic program of vocational training."[64] The specific purposes of the survey were, (1) "to suggest provisions which should be made in the reorganized junior high school for vocational preparatory and vocational education for industry, commerce, agriculture and household arts;" and (2) "to devise a program for industrial, fine and household arts for the elementary schools."[65] It is obvious that these purposes honored the reformers' values of social and economic efficiency. It is also clear that the leadership for these educational innovations was coming from the powerful business and labor interests which had coalesced in the NSPIE.

To actually conduct the survey a Local Survey Committee was organized into sub-committees representing every facet of industrial, commercial, agricultural, and domestic activity carried on in Richmond. Members of these sub-committees were physicians, housewives, educators, social workers, industrialists, sales clerks, labor union leaders, Indiana University professors, the Earlham College President and students, but no ministers.[66] Applying the principles of scientific management, each sub-committee studied in minute detail the tasks that each occupational group performed, and then it recommended that the schools be changed in certain respects to provide students with opportunities to learn these tasks. For examples, the Metal Working Committee recommended that the Richmond schools "can be of real service to machine operators and to industry, by providing night school courses in machine operating and the general work of the machinist."[67] The Printing Committee recommended that a "trade preparatory" printing course "be provided in the Senior High School." The Committee also recommended a "Printing course . . . as a finding course . . . for the Junior High School."[68] The Commercial Employment Committee recommended that a "general information course" emphasizing the "importance" of sales "to the entire community" be offered in the Junior High School. It further recommended that the Senior High School offer commercial courses that "deal largely with manufacturing processes, knowledge of stock and technique of store procedure, rather than generalities regarding the theory of selling."[69] The other sub-committees made similar recommendations occasionally referring for models and justifications to the relevant parts of the NSPIE surveys of Richmond, Virginia,[70] and Minneapolis.[71]

Upon the basis of sub-committee recommendations the Local Survey Committee made its final recommendations per the prior agreement. The Committee commended the Richmond schools "for breaking away from the disciplinary, art craft" approach and for adopting the "life career" plan which called for vocationalizing the curriculum for all pupils "'regardless of sex and future vocation.'"[72] The Committee "heartily" approved the "platoon experiment" for one of the elementary schools.

In addition to these recommendations the Local Survey Committee approved the "proposal that the Garfield school (seventh and eighth grades) be developed into a Junior High School, to include the pupils of the seventh, eighth and ninth grades." The Committee urged that the required courses for all Junior High students be those which were of "general value" to all occupations, as well as "providing some elements that make for practical efficiency." "Electives may be so chosen as to group the work about a life career motive in any one of the larger occupational fields; the professional or liberal arts group, the commercial, the industrial, or agricultural."[73] It seems clear that the NSPIE's major goal of "adapting" the schools to the vocational needs of the youth and community was being realized in Richmond, Indiana.

Finally, the Local Survey Committee recommended that the "character of the work in the several courses" be changed so as to not, as President Roosevelt had said, "put a premium upon literacy training." The Committee urged that "civics" should deal with the practical "everyday problems of community life and the place of the citizen in sharing effectively the problems, local, state, and national . . . rather than with the mere machinery of government." "Science . . . should be approached from situations having immediate, appreciable problems," and "Mathematics . . . should be largely practical or economic arithmetic" with "most of the problems" growing out of the work in practical arts, "particularly as these are studied from the standpoint of the consumer."[74] The other courses, the Committee recommended, should also reflect the immediate social and economic conditions of Richmond.

References to psychological theories emphasizing individual uniqueness in growth and development are conspicuous by their absence in the Richmond Report. This is not strange inasmuch as these educational changes were the doing of reform minded practical men outside of the school, and not the doing of educators operating antiseptically with their psychological theories. That educational decisions should have been made on the grounds of educational theory rather than on grounds of social and economic efficiency needs little defense, especially in view of the commonly observed anti-intellectual temper of much of American life.[75] However, it seems to me that Hofstader errs in placing the blame for this on Dewey's "vagueness," especially if we can assume that Richmond was but one instance of a general movement.[76] Neither can the blame be placed wholly at the door of the practical business man because many educators were also thoroughly committed to the values of social and economic efficiency. The results may have been more gratifying had these educational leaders heeded Jesse Newlon's question: "Efficiency, yes, but efficiency for what?"

Without doubt other significant forces, in addition to the NSPIE, played important roles in effecting these rapid reorganizations. Two of such were the muckrake journalists' attacks on the economic inefficiency of the schools in 1912,[77] and the report of the Committee on Economy of Time of the NEA in 1913.[78] Both of these forces, however, articulated the same values that characterized the NSPIE. In fact, the Committee on Economy of Time was partly staffed by key leaders in the NSPIE.

The NEA Approves and Names it: The Committee on Economy of Time had been thoroughly sensitized by the alleged economic and social inefficiencies in the public schools as was indicated by the number and character of articles and addresses upon which the report was based. Numerous articles by participants in the NSPIE were cited along with references to the retardation and dropout studies by Ayers and others.[79] Also sensitizing the Committee to the NSPIE point of view were three of its members who were active in the NSPIE: Frank

Spaulding,[80] Superintendent of Schools, Newton, Massachusetts, Frank Thompson, Professor of Education, University of Colorado, and Frank L. McVey, President of the University of North Dakota.

Echoing the sentiments of the NSPIE, the Committee on Economy of Time, argued that there was much "waste in education" which was "chargeable to the elementary" school. It was argued on the one hand that eight years of elementary education extended too high the age at which college graduates could begin productive work.[81] On the other hand, the alleged overly academic character of the elementary schools, especially in the seventh and eighth grammar grades, caused too many pupils to drop out at ages fourteen to sixteen ill-prepared for employment in industry or agriculture.

Deliberately taking into account the "vocational movements" purposes, the Committee urged that the elementary school, "the period of general education, should be shortened at least two years."[82] They further recommended, for the first time by this name, "the organization of junior high schools out of the two upper grammar grades and the first-year high-school class" in the belief that this would give "those children who are more given to action than to abstraction" a chance to "begin vocational education, with its practical life-career appeal, at 12 rather than 14."[83] It was argued that this would "save many children from truancy and disinterest." Such a move, it was also argued, would give the bright high school and college bound student an opportunity to appreciate the "industrial" character of his society and give him an early start to college. It was further argued that it would reduce the waste of sixteen years of general education, the "chief excuse" for which had been "culture."

It will be recalled that Eliot's Committee of Ten had recommended this shorten, enrich, and economize the elementary school thesis, but Eliot wanted to add the upper two grades to the high school and make them strictly pre-collegiate in subject matter. Threads of this recommendation are still evident in this 1913 Committee on Economy of Time's recommendation and the Richmond reorganization. But it is also evident that, in large part through the efforts of the NSPIE, the progressive reformers had clearly vocationalized the content and focus of the grammar grades and bequeathed to American education the junior high school.

It is not within the scope of this paper to describe the spread and development of the junior high school. Suffice it to say that by 1920, 386 cities reported 575 junior high schools to the Bureau of Education; and two years later 456 cities reported a total of 733.[84]

Conclusions: In conclusion, it seems altogether warranted to assert that the junior high school was one of many reform mechanisms which emerged during the first two decades of the twentieth century. That the NSPIE played an important role in its birth, and that the values of

social and economic efficiency were more prominent reasons given for it than the psychological theories of G. S. Hall and others seems unquestionable. Clearly it was one of the first parts of the academic ladder to succumb to the onslaughts of the practical, progressive, and business dominated reformers. It was, however, but one leading edge of a host of educational innovations that would become a part of twentieth century American education including the vocational guidance movement, the profession of administration, and the new process of curriculum making based on social needs.

This study also throws light on the processes of educational change. Strikingly clear is the fact that educators are not the initiators of change, rather they are the consumers of change. In this case the initiators of change are members of the power structure in the communities where the school operates. And most often the educators in the schools are unaware of the movements of power in their direction. However, when the educational innovation becomes a fact the educators characteristically praise it, support it, and explain its appearance as being a result of their own educational theory. Such should not be explained as intentional self-deception, but as political naiveness. The account just given is but another instance of George Counts' observation that, "on all genuinely crucial matters the school follows the wishes of the groups or classes that actually rule society."

[1] Charles W. Eliot, "Summary of Subject Offerings and Time Allotments in Forty High Schools," as presented in Edward A. Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), pp. 48-51. Also see Dietrich Gerhard, "The Emergence of the Credit System in American Education Considered as a Problem of Social and Intellectual History," Presidential address before the Historical Association of Greater St. Louis, May, 1953.

[2] Theordore Roosevelt, "Annual Message, December 3, 1907," in *The Addresses*, (1907), Vol. I, pp. 30-31.

[3] National Council of Education, "Report of the Committee on Conference between Colleges and Secondary Schools," *NEA Proceedings*, (1892), p. 754.

[4] National Education Association, *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* (New York: American Book Company, 1894), pp. 46-47.

[5] Charles W. Eliot, *Educational Reform: Essays and Addresses* (New York: The Century Company, 1898), see Chapter VII, "Can School Programs be Shortened and Enriched?", and Chapter XI, "Shortening and Enriching the Grammar School Course."

[6] *Report of the Committee of Ten*, p. 45.

[7] Nelson Bossing and Roscoe Cramer, *The Junior High School* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1965), p. 14. It should be pointed out that this interpretation of Eliot's addresses and the Committee's recommendations conflicts with that of Krug's: *The Shaping of the American High School*, p. 44.

[8] National Education Association, *Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education* (New York: American Book Company, 1895).

[9] National Education Association, "Report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements," *NEA Proceedings*, (1899), pp. 659-660. This Committee's call for a "unified six-year high school course of study beginning with the seventh grade," was echoed by the NEA Committee on Six-Year Course of Study in its 1905, 1907, 1908, and 1909 reports.

[10] Ibid., pp. 659-660.

[11] In 1918 Franklin Bobbit, who was to become one of the leading curriculum experts for the next fifteen years, published *The Curriculum*, and in 1919 the Progressive Education Association was organized.

[12] Richard Hofstader, *The Age of Reform*, (New York: Vintage Books of Random House, 1961). See Chapter IV for a description of these forces.

[13] Gilbert B. Morrison, "Third Report of the Committee on Six-Year Course of Study," *NEA Proceedings*, (1909), p. 409.

[14] Editorial in *The School Review* 47:564-566, (October, 1939). Data based upon a statement prepared in 1935 by N. C. Herionimus, principal of this intermediate school in Richmond, Indiana, in 1896.

[15] "Report of the Committee on Six-Year Course of Study," *NEA Proceedings*, (1908), pp. 625-628. Chairman Lyttle reported on ten cities where the 6-6 plan was in successful operation.

16 Lawrence Cremin, *Transformation of the Schools* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), pp. 116-117.

17 William C. Bagley, *The Educative Process* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1905), p. 60. Bagley, sensing the growing impact of this criterion, wrote critically in 1905 that, "Social efficiency is the standard by which the forces of education must select the experiences that are impressed upon the individual. Every subject of instruction . . . must be measured by this yardstick."

18 Krug, *The Shaping of The American High School*, p. 223.

19 Leonard Ayers, *Laggards in Our Schools* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1909), p. 5.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 90.

21 Raymond Callahan, *Education and The Cult of Efficiency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 18. This study ably documents what happened to the administrators and the schools during the era of efficiency. Also see Raymond Callahan, "Leonard Ayers and the Educational Balance Sheet," History of Education Quarterly, Vol. I, (March 1961), pp. 5-13. In this article Callahan cites the acceptance by administrators of Ayers' dollar criterion for measuring efficiency in the schools.

22 *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1911), p. 11. It is outside of the scope of this paper to give a full and detailed account of the formation and role of the NSPIE. For a brief study of it see Robert Ripley Clough, *National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education: Case History of a Reform Organization*, 1906-1917 (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1957).

23 *NEA Proceedings*, (1905), pp. 141-144. Also see Vanderlip, "The Urgent Need of Trade Schools," *World's Work*, Vol. 12, (June 1906), pp. 7619-24.

24 Charles W. Eliot, "Industrial Education as an Essential Factor in Our National Prosperity," in *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1908), pp. 12-13. During the next three years speaker after speaker referred to the Kingsbury and Ayers studies and urged that the "grammar grades," 7th and 8th, become clearly vocational in their purposes and subject matter. To make them so it was argued would achieve both economic and social efficiency; the individual as well as the United States would prosper and progress. See Charles Morris, "Third Address," *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1908), pp. 82-91; Alexander Humphrey's, "The Economic Value of Industrial Education," *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1908), pp. 26-38; William H. Elson, "Intermediate Industrial Schools," *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1908), pp. 172-179; W. C. Redfield, "The Conservation of Our Human Labor Asset," *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1912), pp. 245-252.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 14.

26 *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1911), p. 11. Jane Addams had urged this path on the last day of the first meeting of the NSPIE, 1908, which was in opposition to Eliot's keynote proposal for a dual system of trade and academic schools. She cautioned the educators to not let the "manufacturers . . . capture the public schools, as forty or fifty years ago, the business men captured the public schools." She chided Eliot's proposal that teachers "sort" the children by saying that it would be a "very bold teacher who should attempt to decide definitely for a child of fourteen, especially if she had taught him for but one year and he was one out of a room full of forty-five or fifty." She concluded the convention by challenging the educational reformers to "fit this trade education not only into the existing organization of the factories on the one hand, but into the existing organization of the schools on the other." Jane Addams, "Discussion," *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1908), pp. 92-97.

[27] *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1907), p. 6. For evidence of the overwhelming positive regard for industrial education see the *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1907-1918), and the *NEA Proceedings*, (1907-1915). One NEA speaker put it in 1909: "the program of this association bristles with the topic." p. 616.

[28] *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1911), p. 11.

[29] John Dewey, "Should Michigan Have Vocational Education Under 'Unit' or 'Dual' Control?" *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1913), p. 29. Dewey further stated that, "If it should be found that the extending of unified control should smother the beef steak of industrial education with so much of the onion sauce of academic studies that the substantial nutriment was no longer recognizable by anybody, then I for one should be in favor of separate control as a measure of desperation, of last resort. But this method of desperation we need not contemplate at present."

[30] Jesse D. Burks, "Results Versus Resolutions- The Present Needs of Industrial Education," *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1910), pp. 139-143.

[31] *Ibid*., pp. 140-141.

[32] *Ibid*., p. 145.

[33] James P. Munroe "The Social Meanings of Industrial Education," *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1910), pp. 181-182.

[34] J. H. Cone, "Treasurer's Report for the Year 1910-11," *NSPIE Proceedings* (1911), p. 19.

[35] *NSPIE Proceedings* (1911), pp. 12-13. The Society projected the following plans: (1) "To collect and study the facts of Industrial Education; to provide for the discussion of methods; to publish information and to spread the results of successful experience in this field." (2) "To aid local authorities and organizations in their endeavors to introduce and organize effective industrial education for their states or communities." (3) "To aid in bringing about State legislation in those states that have not yet made adequate provision for industrial education." (4) "To aid in bringing about National legislation in favor of Industrial Education, of such a character to insure wise and efficient administration of funds for the purpose intended."

[36] Raymond Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962). For a detailed account of these events see Chapters 2 and 3.

[37] Frederick Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management* (New York, 1911), p. 8.

[38] Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*, pp. 42-52.

[39] W. Richard Stephens, *An Analysis of the Educational Ideas of Five Leaders in School Administration, 1910-1930*, (unpublished doctoral dissertation at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, 1964).

[40] Frank Spaulding, "The Application of the Principles of Scientific Management," *NEA Proceedings*, (1913), p. 265. As superintendent at Newton, Spaulding applied the efficiency criterion and changed the schools "from an all-dominant college preparatory objective" to a "comprehensive objective" which included "essential elementary knowledge, training, and discipline; occupational efficiency; and civic responsibility." Using the dollar criterion he reduced the academic emphases of schools that, he said, "ranked so high up among the very best private college preparatory schools," and earned for himself a reputation from his school board as being a potentially effective "leader in any big business." Quoted in Stephens, *Educational Ideas of Leaders*, (1964), pp. 90-100.

[41] James P. Munroe, "President's Address," *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1911), *et passim* pp. 49-56.

[42] James P. Munroe, *New Demands in Education* (New York, 1912), pp. 20-21.

[43] One of the first efforts of the NSPIE to prepare the states for receiving industrial education was made in 1911 through the Page-Wilson bill. Senator Carroll S. Page from Vermont praised the support given to him by the NSPIE in the persons of Snedden and Prosser. He told the 1912 meeting of the Society that his bill "was materially modified to meet the views of Dr. Snedden," and that "Dr. Prosser, the executive secretary of your national organization ... has been a most valuable assistant and coadjutor." *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1912), pp. 116-121. Secretary Prosser reported at the same meeting that the "campaign for federal aid for vocational education in the last Congress was led by the Society." *Ibid.*, p. 299. Prosser further reported that the Society had been of "large service to eight states in the drafting of laws, which in six of them at least, either have passed or are certain to pass this year." *Ibid.*, p. 301. One of the states was Indiana, which passed the bill in 1913 under the leadership of two NSPIE members on the Indiana Commission on Industrial and Agricultural Education. They were Frank Duffy, General Secretary of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Indianapolis, and John Lapp, Director of State Bureau of Legislative and Administrative Information, Indianapolis. For accounts of the influential role of the NSPIE see *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1913), pp. 60-65 and 188-191; (1917), pp. 23-30.

The Page-Wilson bill was defeated because of conflict with the Lever bill, but the NSPIE had its reward six years later with the passage of the Smith-Hughes bill, 1917. President Wilson signed the bill on February 23rd during the Tenth Annual Convention of the NSPIE at Indianapolis. Prosser reported that "The President used four pens made by boys in the Buffalo Vocational School, one going to Senator Hoke Smith and one to Representative Dudley M. Hughes, the foster parent of the bill, one to Senator Page, who fathered it in its earlier days, and one to the office of the NSPIE." *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1917), special supplement, May 1917, p. 3.

Soon after the passage of the Smith-Hughes bill President Wilson appointed a Federal Board for Vocational Education to promote cooperation between the states and the Federal Government and to urge the diffusion of vocational education. The NSPIE was rewarded by having over half of the Board's members come from its leadership rolls: William Redfield, president, NSPIE 1913, and Secretary of Commerce; James P. Munroe, president, NSPIE 1911, industrialist; William B. Wilson, member of Board of Managers, Secretary of Labor; Charles Greathouse, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Indiana during 1961-1917 NSPIE survey.

[44] Charles DeGarmo, "Relation of Industrial to General Education," *School Review* (March, 1909), pp. 150-153. DeGarmo also summoned the Douglas Commission Report of dropouts as a witness for his recommendation.

[45] *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1910), pp. 195-199.

[46] *NSPIE Proceedings*, (1910), pp. 172-179.

[47] Frank F. Bunker, *Reorganization of the Public School System* (Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1916) Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 8, p. 102. For a variety of other examples see pp. 75-95.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 109.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 146. For a fuller description of the effect of this reform on the courses, see Chapter VIII.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

[54] *Educational Review* (February 1910), pp. 210-211. This statement plus Bunker's cited above make clearly suspect Krug's comment on the reorganization that "economy probably was not a motive for such reorganization in most communities." (Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School*, p. 328.) Further contradicting Krug's conclusion is the economic reason given by superintendent Clark of Somerville, Massachusetts, for the junior high reorganizations that he made in the fall of 1914. Confronted with the problem of over crowding in all the elementary schools and the high school, Clark solved the problem "with the best regard for educational efficiency, of economy, and for conveniece of pupils . . . by establishing four junior high shcools . . . ." Boston's Finance Committee also recommended establishing junior high schools "as a fundamental part of the city's school system . . . on the score of both educational efficiency and economy." For these citations as well as other Massachusetts reorganizations see Chester R. Stach, "The Junior High School Movement in Massachusetts," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, (June 1917), pp. 343-346.

[55] *Report of the Commissioner of Education*, (1912), Vol. I, p. 155. Similar reorganizations were made at Columbus, Ohio; Los Angeles, California; and elsewhere.

[56] *Report of the Commissioner of Education*, (1914), Vol. I, p. 147-151.

[57] C. A. Prosser, *Report of the Minneapolis Survey for Vocational Education*, (NSPIE, 2926, Bulletin No. 21) p. 645.

[58] *NSPIE Proceedings* (1912) p. 6. Lapp said that even though separate trade schools had been set up in some states, most states were making vocational education "an integral part of the regular school system." The Indiana law followed Lapp's recommendation which he stated as follows: "The greater ease of modifying existing school courses to meet vocational needs and the greater harmony resulting makes the plan seem advisable." Lapp further argued that this plan pleased the "American people" who are "jealous of any system which separates different groups into classes." p. 8.

[59] Robert J. Leonard, *Richmond Survey for Vocational Education* (Indianapolis: The Indiana State Board of Education, 1916), p. 4.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[62] *Ibid.*, pp. viii-ix. It was undoubtedly due to Greathouse's cooperation with the NSPIE that earned him the appointment to the Federal Board for Vocational Education in 1917.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. ix.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 9-13.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 79. It is important to note that this approach to curriculum making anticipates by at least four years Franklin Bobbitt's formulation of it in his book *The Curriculum* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, Co., 1918).

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 368.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 545.

[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 545-548.

[74] *Ibid.*, pp. 551-554.

[75] Richard Hofstader, *Anti-intellectualism in American Life* (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 375.

[76] Raymond Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1962). This study clearly demonstrates that the business ethic was wide spread.

[77] *Ibid.*, Chapter 1.

[78] *Report of the Committee of the National Council of Education on Economy of Time in Education* (Government Printing Office, 1913) United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 38.

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 93-103.

[80] For an account of Spaulding's ideas and influences see Stephens, *Ibid.*, pp. 88-122.

[81] *Report of Committee*, (1913), p. 9.

[82] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[83] *Ibid.*, pp. 23-25.

[84] Bureau of Education, *City School Leaflet* No. 12, (September, 1963).

THE 'DELICATE DUTY' OF CHILD SAVING: COLDWATER, MICHIGAN, 1871–1896*

Robert S. Patterson, Professor
Department of Educational Foundations
University of Alberta, Edmonton
and
Patricia Rooke
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Educational Foundations
University of Alberta, Edmonton

*This paper was to be delivered at the 1975 meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society. Because of a previous commitment the authors were unable to present their work. The editor is publishing it in the supplement because of its interest to the society.

> Their destitution, their vagrant life, their depraved habits, their ragged and filthy condition forbid their reception into the ordinary schools of the people....They are born to crime, brought up for it. They must be saved.
>
> Enoch Vines (1880)

> The high character of any Commonwealth is founded on the morals, intelligence and industry of the people. Each child saved is one more pillar of the strong state edifice....
>
> C. D. Randall (1897)

In the nineteenth century there were two classes which were viewed by their "betters" more with suspicion than with compassion. There was the "dangerous class," consisting of those people who were criminal and there was the "perishing class," consisting of those who were potentially criminal.[1] This understanding of the "perishing and dangerous classes" was transatlantic. Middle class persons in Europe and North America alike shuddered respectably at its implications and determined to do something about it. Whether their motives were for social control or for social improvement remains a question mark.[2] It was most likely a mixture of both. However, middle class reformers, sectarians, humanitarians, evangelicals and philanthropists seemed to agree that children without "taint of crime" were of the perishing class. If delinquent children might possibly be "saved" then dependent children could certainly be "saved".

By the middle of the century "scientific charity" had created a scourge of childsaving agencies and institutions.[3] However, even a generous mixture of private and public philanthropy could not stem the rising tide of poverty, dependency, pauperism and depravity. The State Public School at Coldwater, Michigan, was established on May 14, 1874, in recognition of the limitations of private charity. It was the "first of its kind" – a government institution where dependent children could be "educated morally and mentally and also taught habits of

industry."[4] There had been no dearth of institutions for neglected children before the Act to Establish a State Public School for Dependent and Neglected Children was passed in Michigan in 1871. Poorhouses and almshouses refuges and reformatories, orphanages and asylums, penal establishments and county jails, had all previously and quite indiscriminately served this purpose. As "the first of its kind" however, Coldwater expressly stipulated its walls were open only to the dependent child between the ages of 4 and 16 years and it was to be part of the educational system and not of the penal system.[5]

The institution officially rejected the practice of caring for the dependent and delinquent together as if they were in the same category. It also deplored the current practice of housing the dependent child in asylums whose "fetid atmosphere propogated and perpetuated a pauper race." In such circumstances "the impressible child took its first lessons in dependence and depravity." It was a bedlum nursery with "the raving of the maniac, the frightful contortions of the epileptic and the drivelling and senseless sputtering of the idiot."[6] The child by all means must be saved from corruption, that is, separated from vicious or slothful adults and removed from such an environment. Incarceration had been and was seen by many as the means to salvation. It was "for their own good." Coldwater however was designed to be selective and had clear policies prohibiting the diseased or deformed.[7]

The feature that made it "the first of its kind" was that it was more a remand home than a reformatory. The institution was seen as a temporary educational residence. Instruction was aimed at the reduction of undesirable habits, the inculcation of good habits and the prevention of indolence. The second phase of this education was the eventual "placing" of the dependent child into a desirable family. The family, after all, was "god's reformatory" according to Charles Loring Brace, founder of the Children's Aid Society. The best the institution could expect was a "physical and moral regeneration" before indenture, adoption or placing out. Orphanages were viewed as costly and inefficient charity whereas arguments for 'placing-out' were as much social and economic as humanitarian.

> The establishing of this school...is a step in the right direction to lessen pauperism and prevent crime...place them in a way of becoming useful citizens and self supporting rather than expend thousands of dollars to build prisons and keep them shut up at great expense....[8]

No child was to be admitted without evidence heard in the probate court. After all "even a destitute child has rights and these rights and the rights of the parents are respected."[9] An ominous ring might be detected when this exhortation to respect poor people's rights was followed by "but admission to the State public school forfeits all parental rights." Child savers knew it was a "delicate duty" to "deprive parents of their children,"[10] but, had not the Pennsylvania State Supreme Court Decision of 1830 set the precedent that "the right of

parental control is a natural but not an unalienable one?"[11] Child savers were particularly solicitous of those children maintained in the country poorhouses or who had been abandoned by their parents, who were orphans or whose parents had been convicted of crime. As yet "unstained" by crime these dependent children were only flawed by poverty.

To be flawed by poverty in a land of plenty was seen as no small imperfection and to be saved from poverty was seen as no insignificant achievement. By the mid-nineteenth century, after the flood of religious enthusiasm that had followed the first and second "great awakenings," sectarian and secular philanthropy were often barely distinguishable.[12] Both kinds confirmed the millenial faith of the general public – a faith in the possibility of good government, prosperity and happiness. C. D. Randall vaguely recognized the common impulse behind both sectarian and secular philanthropy when he said of the State Public School, "The Christian civilization of our times had placed it there."[13] The great awakenings had softened Calvinistic doctrines of innate depravity. Now all men could be saved. Ignorance could be abolished and regeneration and conversion were important. This must have been a great emotional relief to many people, confident now that free, saved individuals could create a moral society and the race could be "improved."[14] Calvinist doctrine could not entirely be eradicated, however. There was still the inclination to equate worldly and material success with being a member of the Elect but it also seemed true that one could not rise in the world without morality. Child savers therefore saw to it that dependent children were appropriately edified. The child had to be saved from atheism and depravity as well as pauperism. The State Public School, for example, made sure its clients attended city churches on Sundays or chapel services at the school. Coldwater citizens conducted Sunday schools at the institution and during the week the children received further instruction from a national series of sunday school lessons.[15]

Poverty and sinfulness had always been correlated by most observers. However, in the nineteenth century there was some modification of this principle in that poverty came to be seen as neither permanent nor inevitable. In addition, John Locke had shown that the child was "tabula rasa" and as receptive to good habits as to vice. A deluge of this and other intellectual insights made child saving seem perfectly reasonable. These insights stemmed from religious sources, republican sentiments and enlightenment beliefs in a national world. They ranged from romanticism, transcendentalism, utilitarianism, Social Darwinism, Malthusianism, Eugenics, environmentalism, phrenology and scientific management. But they all added up to one thing. The social problems of the day were potentially transitory. Society and man were perfectable.[16]

The State Public School then was conceived in a time of intellectual vitality. By 1874, the battles which had raged since John Howard's reports on the state of prisons in the eighteenth century, had by no

means been resolved. The main arena of debate was the dispute over the role of nature and nurture in criminal conduct, dependency and pauperism. Laissez-faire sympathizers generally preferred to leave well enough alone. Surprisingly enough though, Herbert Spencer, that veritable opponent of state relief was able to acknowledge the value of private philanthropy inasmuch as it contributed to the character-building of the philanthropist! The evangelicals insisted that one could not leave well alone because things were obviously not well. Oscar McCullogh's The Tribe of Israel: A Study in Degradation (1868) and Richard. Dugdale's The Jukes: A Study in Pauperism, Disease and Heredity (1877) argued pseudo-scientifically that dependents and criminals were born and only incidentally "made", and moral weakness was biologically transmitted. The "environmentalists" did not concur. Some very lively intellectuals from North America and Europe joined in the fray and offered their opinions on the matter including Cesare Lombroso, Benjamin Rush and Lester F. Ward. Discussions went back and forth on all manner of concerns related to child reform and dependency ranging across such topics as industrial training, pauper children, phrenology, the role of families, child rearing and common schooling. Pestalozzi, Bronson Alcott, Charles Cooley, Johann Wichern, Dorothea Dix and Lydia Child all contributed their views.[17]

With all the controversy resounding around them, reformers and institutions kept popping up over the land like so many mushrooms, the State Public School at Coldwater being only one of them. Refuges in New York, Boston and Philadelphia were founded between 1825 and 1828. The Massachusetts State Reformatory for Boys (1854) and for girls (1855) saw the serious entry into the field of charity by the State. The latter institution was the first to experiment with the "cottage system" and served in part as a model for Coldwater. All manner of agencies, institutions and societies flourished. By 1850, New York State alone had twenty-seven institutions for child reform which was a far cry from the eighteenth century when George Whitefield's Bethesda Orphan Asylum, Georgia, was the only institution of its kind.[18]

A formidable army of reformers, philanthropists and humanitarians, some with religious inclinations, others with fewer overt inclinations, marched over the United States from north to south. Their exemplars were committed and unflagging; including such men as Charles Loring Brace, Reverend Joseph Tuckerman, John Criscom, Peter Jay and Samuel Gridley Howe. It may be argued that this army of reformers was threatened by the instability and change around it, or terrorized into philanthropy by the immigrants pouring into the cities and was therefore determined to impose its middle class protestant respectability onto the newcomers and onto the poor. This may well be so; such arguments have sufficient evidence on their side to make the case. Nevertheless it would be naive at best to argue that self-serving perceptions alone motivated reformers and "institutionalizers." One cannot ignore the objective conditions of industrialization, rapid urbanization and immigration. To ignore real problems and call them all mistaken perceptions is to distort history and turn it into a

psychodrama of motives, consensus and conspiracies – usually always "nasty."

The reformers did not imagine squalor and poverty.[19] They were as much appalled at human wastage, abuse and neglect, as they were afraid of it. Their mistake was that they saw poverty as a cause and not as a condition. They did not seem to think anything caused poverty except poverty itself. Because poverty was so repugnant to them they concluded it had to be related to those other social aspects they disapproved of; intemperance, gambling, sabbath breaking, profanity and ignorance. They wanted to save people from poverty by removing them from it in the same way they wanted to save people from sin by removing them from brothels, gin shops, gambling dens and dance halls. The reformers tried to pluck out every conceivable vice, real and exaggerated, that offended their sensibilities. They opposed lotteries and obscenity and they prosecuted atheists and grog-shop owners. They just as passionately helped orphans, juvenile mendicants, distressed widows and fallen women. They savagely criticized poverty and drunkenness in the same breath. Even "tippling," was abhorrent to them. It not only allegedly caused profilgacy and profanity, but it led to all manner of shameful acts including murder and blasphemy and virgins yielding their virtue and seducers lusting after virgins.

Children had to be saved from all of this before vice and poverty became a bad habit with them. Children had to be snatched from depraved parents and intemperate associates. Ragpickers, wood-thieves, streetcleaners, bootblacks, pickpockets as well as such other outcasts as the neglected, the abused and the dependent were saved from the docks, from under stairways, from the tenements and alas, all too often, from their families.

The Nineteenth Century can truly be called the century of the institution. Social policy consciously created them both on a regional and a national basis. They were seen as a panacea for all distress. They were structured on reasonable tenets to master unacceptable phenonemon such as insanity, vagrancy, crime, pauperism and dependency.[20] Institutions were built for the distracted, the diseased, the prolifigate, the aged, the insane, the orphan, the fugitive slave, the infirm, the criminal and the delinquent. The prevention of crime and pauperism were seen as imperatives. They were as unacceptable as ladies of the night were and viewed with like repugnance.

The State Public School at Michigan was probably neither much better nor much worse than other institutions of its type.[21] Indeed its similarities are more striking than its differences despite the claim "it was one of its kind." Like the Boston Children's Friend Society, the Coldwater child savers wanted to save those "whose plastic natures may be molded into images of perfect beauty, or as perfect repulsiveness."[22] In order to do this, discipline, order, industry and obedience were the watchwords and overseers of the routine, management, education and activities of the institution. Five

similarities between the State Public School and other child reform institutions were (1) the Cottage System, (2) its "placing-out" program, (3) its stress on useful labor, (4) its stress on discipline, and (5) its educational system.

C. D. Randall was insistent that the State Public School "must not be an overgrown poorhouse with low grade employees. It must be a plain and pleasant home..," – a "cheerful educational home."[23] In this he was in accord with Joseph Tuckerman and Mary Carpenter who had both been influenced by Johann Winchern's Rauhe Hause in Hamburg, Germany. The congregate system of refuges and reformatories was seen as inhumane, impersonal and morally damaging. A child's natural inclination, it was believed, was for a family setting.

> The children and anyone interested in their behalf should recognize the proposed establishment as a temporary home while the child is on its way to its natural home in the family.[24]

The family was a "discovery," so to speak of, in the nineteenth century.[25] It was seen as the fountain of morality, the foundation of stability and the pillar of authority. It was the origin of loving restraint. Men like Bronson Alcott rhapsodized about the family, children, parents (especially motherhood) and child rearing. Middle class people thought he said it all quite beautifully and took him to heart when he declared that "shades of the prison" could only obscure the child's path to perfection.[26]

It was deemed best for the child to have a home of his own, but short of that, the State Public School would model itself as closely as possible on the middle class family. Dormitories were not seen as fittingly "nice" and probably were conducive to vice. Cottages of approximately twenty-five children with a female manager for a surrogate mother (kind but firm) were considered the ideal environment. The dependent children would live in these "little villages of cottages" for less than a year while eating in a common dining room and working, playing and praying together communally.

The cottage system envisioned and applied at Coldwater was best complemented by pastoral harmony. In reaction to urbanization the countryside was usually seen as the cleanest, simplest, and safest environment in which to raise and to save children. Coldwater's bid offered the dual advantage of a rural environment that could also enjoy the opportunities available in the neighboring town. The pastoral inclinations of educators and child savers are reminiscent of the pedagogical advice given in Rousseau's Emile which suggested the isolation of the child from the contaminations of an urban setting and the countryside being the desirable setting to the perfecting of the child's nature. Rousseau's influence cannot be underestimated. If possible, the dependent children after their basic training program at Coldwater would be "placed-out" into rural homes preferably, where they could breathe the fresh protestant air and where a street urchin

could become a guileless farm boy![27]

Because "suitable homes with good families" were disinclined to take dependent children immediately there was a need for an intermediary institution such as the State Public School where children could be kept until they were "morally regenerated."[28] Although less than a year was deemed usual for such regeneration, in fact this was not always the case. For instance, seventy-seven children in 1887 had been there for more than two years. The moral regeneration of these children, it would seem, was a more arduous task than anticipated. They were still prone to all manner of wickedness and related afflictions including disease, poor health, laziness, viciousness, soreheadedness and troublesome dispositions. Physical attributes and handicaps also served as a deterrent to adoption. Being colored, Indian and feebleminded were reasons for rejection and one poor lad was even cross-eyed! Others still, used profanity and vulgarity and fought, drank, smoked or chewed.[29]

The State Public School had what appeared to be a foolproof method of "placing-out."[30] In 1873 an office was established by law for an agent to be responsible in each county for selecting "suitable homes" for procedures of placing the children and for an annual inspection thereafter of such placements. Those seeking a child had to be of good moral standing, abstainers and able to support and educate the child. One might suspect they were also expected to be protestant as was the case in other institutions.[31] The State School "not being sectarian" did not "seek to place children in families of the religion of the parents" but welcomed "aid from the churches" that desired to do so.[32] Guarantees had to be provided by the new home that the child attend a district school for at least four months out of each year.

The State stipulated the child could be "freed" in one of three ways; by adoption, by reaching the age of sixteen and thus being declared self-supporting, or on a claim by the natural parents. However the parents could reclaim the child only if they proved themselves "worthy". Despite the cant of respecting the integrity of family life, this latter recourse was viewed with caution in relation to poor families. To the childsavers there seemed sufficient evidence that parental neglect had caused criminality and that pauperism perpetuated itself. For example, Louis Dwight of the American Bible Society gave such evidence in 1825:

> It is the confession of many convicts at Auburn and Wethersfield that the course of vice which brought them to prison...commended in disobedience to their parents or in their parents neglect.[33]

That the system of placing-out was foolproof is dubious given that of seventy-eight counties only thirty appointed agents to supervise the placements. This office was established by law in 1873 and was under the director of the Board of Corrections and Charities. Also because

remuneration was small and the demands of service were heavy some agents may not have been as able or as conscientious as was necessary.[34] (For instance, a question to the Governor on January, 1890, went so far as to ask whether the agent for Charlevoix was an imbecile!) Child abuse and exploitation were therefore probably not infrequent. However, indentures could be and were cancelled.[35]

"Placing-out" as a solution for child dependency goes as far back as the Poor Law of 1601 and certainly was common enough practice in Colonial America. The Puritans used it as part and parcel of their intricate familial relationships.[36] However, such apprenticeship and indenture were not only for the poor and they were not normally seen as punitive. Although in theory, the Nineteenth Century and the State Public School at Coldwater did not see placing-out as punitive it remains that usually only the poor and the delinquent went through the process. One might say it carried some of the connotations of the past practice of auctioning off the poor to the lowest bidder.[37] This practice was one of actually "consigning free born boys and girls to involuntary servitude simply because they were poor."[38] The children who were "placed" could be adopted, fostered or indentured. In the case of the State Public School as with other institutions it was school policy to deny information to the natural parents on the whereabouts of their child.[39]

The nineteenth century child savers believed in Labour, no matter how dreary the task or how paltry the renumeration. It was a good in itself and it was good, if not for the soul, then certainly for the character. Labor was a good for private reasons and it was good for public prosperity. Idleness was the vacuum they most abhorred. Indoor and outdoor relief, charity and the dole, were no cure for pauperism – these destroyed incentive. The childsavers sincerely believed that their dependent charges would gain by labor, and the institution itself undoubtedly did on economic grounds. Justification of the institution in part related to this economic consideration. The society at large was still not entirely comfortable with the position of public funding of institutions. Laissez-faire economics and voluntary private philanthropy had served the purpose previously and many tax-payers then were no more happy about the new techniques of institution management than some people today who grumble at increasing social welfare benefits. As public funding was still not a universal principle an institution that struggled to give some semblance of being self-supporting usually found favor. Samuel Smiles and his Self-Help had still not diminished. In addition to these concerns a child who could be set to certain tasks and perform these diligently would have a greater chance of being placed. Financial support from the legislature was more guaranteed if operating costs were cut by such labor. The precedents of the past in workhouses and "schools of industry" clearly demonstrated labor trained the mind and strengthened the will even as it tired the body. Such satisfactory habits as fortitude, self-help, industry and efficiency were learned through labor.

The child savers of Coldwater were not exceptional. They boasted their institution aimed at "proper moral and physical training as well as instruction in how to labor." They wanted to inculcate the regular "habit" of labor by the occupation of each child's time in some "worth while, demanding activity." Neither were the child savers of Coldwater exceptional in the kinds of labor they required. Three hours daily were set aside for labor with approximately the same amount of time set aside for school work. The remaining part of the day was devoted to recreation, peppered with prayers, devotions and moral exhortations.

> From fifteen to eighteen are employed making beds, sweeping and scrubbing the cottages. About the same number are employed on the farm, in caring for the animals, milking, working in the garden, hauling wood, etc. The dining room and kitchen employed twenty-five children. Quite a number work in the bakery, laundry, engine and sewing rooms, while twelve are learning the shoemaking business."[40]

The very young children were "yet old enough to do something" also. They knitted suspenders, garters, mittens and stockings.

Habits of obedience and cheerfulness gained through labor were closely related to matters of discipline. Nineteenth century institutions generally stressed order, labor, usefulness and discipline.[41] Many modelled themselves on either army or factory models which both stressed obedience and efficiency. The State Public School proved itself not unique in this respect. It boasted of a drum and fife band of some sixty boys, established in 1876, which marched the children to church, meals and classes, in tidy and compliant lines. Drill was a regular activity for it taught "obedience, order, precision self-government, and promptness." Drill was seen as a better method of discipline than those methods common enough in the past to reform institutions, such as the ball and chain, cat of nine tails, doses of salts, leg irons, deprivation and solitary confinement. One could not dispute this. It was better in the minds of the childsavers to drill children rather than to whip, warn, correct, chastise and even execute. Gentle and loving measures were advocated but the value of drill, discipline and labor were never underestimated. Some rude, stubborn or unruly characters no doubt required firmer measures than drilling.[42]

The State Public School claimed it was essentially an educational institution and not part of the penal system. The formal educational process conducted in the school was modelled after the common school program as much as the different circumstances allowed. The course of formal study included calisthenics, singing, geography of the schoolroom, cyphering, counting, spelling, reading and slate drawing. Common school texts were used such as Sheldon's Object Lessons, Hager's Primary Arithmetic, Harvey's Third Reader, Swinton's Language Primer, and Anderson's Junior Class History of the United States.[43] Because of the transitory school population the general level

of education did not exceed upper elementary grades. At the same time however the condition of the classrooms when the population exceeded two hundred was likely so crowded that learning was retarded. The seating capacity had been estimated at 219 in 1887 but the monthly attendances usually exceeded this figure up to 246 in March and April.[44] This point however lends itself to tantalizing comparisons of classroom sizes, pupil/teacher ratios, and achievement levels with the common schools in the State of Michigan. Given the criticism levelled at the latter and the generally low standards of schooling in the last decades of the nineteenth century the State Public School at Coldwater may have been neither better nor worse in this matter.

It may be concluded however that formal education was never the primary object of the school but that sound moral training always was. Truthfulness, sobriety, cheerfulness, thrift and industry were usually viewed as the better part of education by the child savers. They preferred humility and gratitude to intellectual vanities. They saw the dependent child as potentially criminal but redeemable. A thorough dose of moralizing was seen as better medicine for curing bad habits than reading or writing. In his drab but spotless uniform this potential criminal became the "saved child" who could contribute to a productive and diligent citizenry.

The children who went through the Coldwater State Public School in the Nineteenth Century are only one small part of the dreary regimen of human wretchedness that makes for such melancholy reading. The child savers and the child "saved" illumine the dilemma that is with us still. We have not yet resolved the dilemma – that "delicate duty" of deciding who should be deprived of their families and how or what to do with those with no families.

The authors have attempted to place the State School in the context of its time. In so doing they have not provided a comprehensive description of the institution. Purportedly, Coldwater was different. More analysis needs to be undertaken similar to that done on the New York House of Refuge[45] to ascertain the validity of this not infrequent assertion by leading proponents and defenders of the State Public School. The challenge remains to determine the influence of race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, religion on the acceptance of the child by the institution and by the families interested in adoption. A follow-up of the children who attended the institution should assist solving this problem – certainly an examination of the conditions pertaining to their "placing-out". Yet another question is, how were the children recruited into the institution and from what environments? Were they predominantly orphaned and destitute and not deliquent? Were they from one parent or regular homes? What adult influences were they being "rescued" from? What procedures were used for such recruitment? Were they predominantly remanded by the courts, voluntarily committed by parents or guardians or did the institution itself in some way recruit them? Fruitful analysis can be made of the religious and ethnic origins of the children's families. What were the

social, economic and religious backgrounds of those who sponsored the institution, of those who promoted the school and of those who were the guards, teachers, superintendent and chief officers of the school? This should be studied over a period of time to establish any changing patterns.

No matter what the public statements were concerning the status of the children involved one must persist in establishing whether they were in fact treated as delinquent? If the State Public School at Coldwater was different one must establish to what extent this was, or was not, the case.

Note on Primary Source Materials

The Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan, were examined covering the years 1875-1881 and 1883, Volumes 39-45 and 47. Letters that were helpful in providing some insight into the public concern for the institution were in Executive Office Papers – Incoming Mail on State Public School covering the years 1871 to 1873 and 1885 to 1890. These mainly dealt with matters of business over selection of the site, the construction and the indenturing of children. Inasmuch as the outgoing letters of the Chief Executive Office were burned, the letters remaining offer little insight into the attitude of the governors on the school. The Messages of the Governors of Michigan, Vol. III, Edited by G. N. Fuller, Michigan Historical Commission, Lansing, Michigan, 1927, include excerpts from governor speeches. The Minutes of the Board of Control for the State Public School, Vol. I, September 26, 1871-June 8, 1906 includes action on reception of children, adoptions and indentures. Entry is chronological The Reports of Superintendent to the Board of Control of the State Public School, 1885-1900, consist of narrative reports written within a printed outline relating to general conditions of school, students, employees and statistics of population movements, condition of current expense accounts, bills and communications, and recommendations affecting the care of children, improvements and changes. Entry is chronological.

NOTES

[1] The term "dangerous class" first appeared in the Oxford English Dictionary in 1859 but had already been the subject of Mary Carpenter's "Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes..." in 1851. For a history of these terms see J. J. Tobias, *Crime and Industrial Society in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1967), pp. 52-55.

[2] For discussion and examples of these themes see Lois Banner, "Religious Benevolence as Social Control: A Critique of an Interpretation," *Journal of American History*, LX (June 1973), pp. 23-41; Carrol Smith Rosenberg, *Religion and the Rise of the American City: The New York City Mission Movement, 1812-1870* (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1971) and Clifford S. Griffin, *Their Brothers Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800-1865* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1960).

[3] See Walter I. Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America* (New York: The Free Press, 1974), pp. 75-95 and Roy Lubove, *The Professional Altruist – The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965). Scientific charity was based as much on notions of Social Darwinism, Malthusianism, Manchesterian economics, managerial techniques and the efficient organization of philanthropic resources as on the rescue-motive or the evangelical impulse.

[4] Record Group 65-11, Records of the *Children's Institute* in the Michigan Historical Commission Archives, Lansing, Michigan, p. 395.

[5] Actually the age stipulation vacillated on either side, for example, as early as 1876 it changed to 3-14 years.

[6] Record Group 65-11, p. 395.

[7] This was often infringed upon. For instance, the Report of the Superintendent on May 6, 1879, indicated that children were returned to counties for being idiotic or feebleminded.

[8] This is clear in the *41st Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan*, 1877, pp. 64-65. C. D. Randall, Record Group 65-11, p. 397, uses a mystifying display of mathematical juggling with population figures, costs, dependence, percentages and numbers of paupers, to demonstrate the institution had actually in 21 years minimized pauperism and decreased dependency. As the writer was also one of the founders and subsequent propagandists of the institution, the figures are not overly dependable.

[9] C. D. Randall, "The Michigan System of Child Saving," *The American Journal of Sociology*, I (1896) in R. H. Bremner, editor, *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, Vol. I, 1600-1865 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970), p. 264. Randall was a senator from Coldwater and a leading figure in establishing the school. He drafted the original legislation and led Coldwater in pressing its case for the school by tendering a bid to the State of $425,000 and 20 acres of land. He remained Coldwater's most ardent supporter until a new Committee was formed in 1891.

[10] A child saver, Frank B. Kay, rather sanctimoniously added to this statement, "for the liquids they imbibe do not quench parental love," in "The protection of Neglected and Abused Children," (1894).

[11] Quoted in Robert M. Mennel, *Thorns and Thistles: Juvenile Delinquents in the United States, 1825-1940* (Hanover, Hampshire: The University Press of New England, 1973), p. 14.

[12] See Rosenberg and also a brilliant exposition of the "rescue motive" in Ford K. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961).

[13] Record Group 65-11, p. 396.

[14] Gerald N. Grob, Mental Institutions in America: *Social Policy to 1875* (New York: The Free Press, 1973) summarizes this attitude. "When this belief in the free individual was fused with the millenial vision of a society performing a divine mission, without eradicating all evidence of evil, however, one strain of evangelical protestantism was transformed into an activistic social force seeking the abolition of those restraints that bound the individual and hindered his self-development." p. 49.

[15] *Minutes of Board*, March 28, 1887.

[16] The following books have contributed to the above, all too brief summary, of the intellectual background related to child reform and the changing intellectual currents which influenced nineteenth century thought. Philippe Aries, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962); Carroll Smith Rosenberg; David J. Rothman, *The Discovery of the Asylum – Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* (Boston-Toronto: Little Brown & Co., 1971); Kathleen Woodroofe, *From Charity to Social Work: In England and the United States* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961). For articles see Lois W. Banner; John C. Crandall, "Patriotism and Humanitarian Reform in Children's Literature, 1825-1860," *American Quarterly*, XXI, 1 (1969), pp. 3-22; John L. Thomas, "Romantic Reform in American, 1815-1865," *American Quarterly*, XVII, 4 (Winter 1965), pp. 656-681 and Charles Strickland, "A Transcendalist Father: the Child Rearing Practices of Bronson Alcott," *Perspectives in American History*, III (1969), pp. 5-16.

[17] The State Public School acknowledged as a "preventative" institution its policies were indebted to such intellectual discussion. *Still Photographs of the State Public School at Coldwater*, Vol. I.

[18] The following books discuss the upsurge of institutionalization especially in relation to child reform. Robert S. Pickett, *House of Refuge: Origins of Juvenile Reform in New York State, 1815-1857* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1969); Robert M. Mennel, [*op cit*], Anthony M. Platt, *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1969); Gerald N. Grob, [*op cit*], Joseph M. Hawes, *Children in Urban Society: Juvenile Delinquency in Nineteenth Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971) and Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, Vol. II – *From the Eighteenth Century to the Children Act 1848 – Studies in Social History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973).

[19] David Dudley Field, "The Child and the State," *The Forum*, I, 1886, pp. 106-109, Bremner, p. 205 describes the conditions he wants to save a five-year old boy from. If one forgives the moralizing so often found in this and similar lurid accounts one catches appalling glimpses of objective conditions in reformatories, prisons, asylums and tenements. Field's account protests that charity is "an impulse of the heart" but that "the State is not founded for charity but for protection...."

[20] David Rothman says that institutions were the result of a drive to bring forms of madness, e.g., poverty, delinquency and dependency, "under the rigid and unbending control of reason." p. xvii.

[21] This, despite the noisy praises from people such as Mary-Carpenter, the leading English reformer, Drouin L'hues, Minister under Louis Napoleon, the National Education Associate in Washington, 1880, and various prominant others. The reality, as so often happens, was sadder than the rhetoric.

[22] Rothman, p. 213.

[23] Record Group 65-11, p. 396.

[24] *Committee Report to the State* of 1871 on the bill to establish the State Public School of Michigan, Record Group 65-11, p. 398. Enoch C. Vines, "The State of Prisons and Child Saving Institutions in the Civilized World" (1880) suggested a plan very similar to the one already in use at Coldwater. He stressed the "cottage system."

[25] Philippe Aries discusses this in Part 3, pp. 339-405.

[26] See Charles Strickland.

[27] Richard Wohl elaborates this theme. Horatio Alger also perpetuates the "country boy myth" in *Ragged Dick*. George C. Needham disclaims against the city in "Street Arabs and Gutter Snipes – The Pathetic and Humorous Side of Young Vagabond Life in the Great Cities, with Records of Work for Their Reclamation" (1884). The New York Fresh Air Fund and the William George Junior Republic responded to the pastoral urge as is seen in Jack Holl, *Juvenile Reform in the Progressive Era* (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1971) and Joel Spring, *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State* (Boston, Beacon Press, 1972).

[28] Westerners were particularly resentful of what they viewed as juvenile criminals being dumped on their doorsteps by the Children's Aid Society. Brace began his "emigrant parties" in 1854. Twenty-five years later, 50,000 children had been effectively "saved," that is, placed out.

[29] *Report of Superintendent*, January 31, 1887.

[30] The stipulations of placing-out are found in *Minutes of the Board of Control for the State Public School*, Vol. I, p. 396.

[31] Mennell discusses this aspect. Also Levi Silliman Ives (1797-1867) was reputed to saying of the separation of children from parents and religion, that "What charity commenced fanaticism has grossly perverted; or what we supposed charity turns out to be only sectarian zeal."

[32] Bremner, p. 265.

[33] Rothman, p. 33.

[34] *41st Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan*, 1877, p. 68.

[35] That cancellation was no empty threat is evidenced in the documents examined, as in the case of the Superintendent of the Board's Report, March 3, 1880. The Report of Superintendent Foster, March 29, 1886, declared Louisianna an unsuitable state for "placing-out" because of its lack of public schools.

[36] For an understanding of the Puritan legacy of child rearing and indenturing see Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, New Edition, Revised and enlarged (New York: Harper and Row, 1966).

[37] Samuel Hopkins Adams, *Grandfather Attends a Vendue* (New York: 1820), as cited in Bremner, p. 263.

[38] Bremner, p. 64.

[39] The incoming mail of the Governors of Michigan in the late Nineteenth Century indicates that one of the most consistent concerns was the constant appeal by parents for the return of their children.

[40] *40th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan*, 1876, p. 171.

[41] See Rothman, p. 213.

[42] For example, Mr. Foster was charged by some employees as being too strict. While other charges of his case seemed to indicate this was a "trumped-up" one, there are indications that strict discipline was not infrequently resorted to. *Minutes of Board*, March 28, 1887.

[43] *45th Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan*, 1881, p. 106.

[44] Report of Superintendent, November 22, 1887.

[45] Robert S. Pickett, [*op. cit.*]. It was noted by Professor Steven Schlossman in his paper on "The Institution and the Social Order – The Reformatory," delivered at the American Historical Association, December 29, 1974, that there is a need for larger and specific case studies in this area.

PART III

PROCEEDINGS

PART III

The 1975 Meeting of the Midwest
History of Education Society

Friday and Saturday
October 24-25

Loyola University of Chicago, Regis Room
Marquette Center
820 North Rush Street
Chicago, Illinois

Afternoon Session Friday, October 24, 1975

1:30- 2:30 p.m. – Registration, Coffee

2:30- 5:00 p.m. – Afternoon Session

Presiding: Rosemary Donatelli
Vice President and Program Chairman
Midwest History of Educational Society

Speaker: Robert V. Bullough, Jr.
Ohio State University

Topic: "HAROLD RUGG: EDUCATOR IN SEARCH OF THE AUTHENTIC GESTURE"

Speaker: Robert E. Belding
University of Iowa

Topic: "CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF A PERSISTENT JOURNAL"

Speaker: Kay H. Kamin
Rosary College

Topic: "SCHOOL GOVERNANCE BY WOMEN: THE STEPPING STONE TO POLITICAL PARTICIPATION"

Evening Session Friday, October 24, 1975

5:00 – Cocktails, Presidents' Room

6:00 – Dinner, Georgetown Room

7:00- 9:00 p.m. – After Dinner Presentations

Presiding: David Ripley, President
Midwest History of Education Society

Welcome: John M. Wozniak, Dean
School of Education, Loyola University

Speaker: Mark M. Krug
University of Chicago

Topic: "JANE ADDAMS, THE HULL HOUSE, AND THE EDUCATION OF THE IMMIGRANTS

Morning Session Saturday, October 25, 1975

9:00-11:00 a.m. – Morning Program

Presiding: B. Edward McClellan, Secretary
Midwest History of Education Society

Speaker: Harold B. Dunkel
University of Chicago

Topic: "THE ST. LOUIS SPARKPLUG:
HENRY C. BROKMEYER"

Speaker: Jay Wissot
California State College – San Bernadino

Topic: TWO TREATMENTS OF CULTURAL DIFFERENCE: DEWEY ON NATIONALISM AND KALLEN ON PLURALISM"

11:00-12:00 Noon – Business Meeting

Presiding: David Ripley

MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Minutes of the Meeting
October 25, 1975

The Midwest History of Education Society convened its business meeting on Saturday, October 25th at 11:00 a.m. in the President's Room, Loyola University of Chicago. President David Ripley presided.

The minutes of the 1974 meeting were read by the Secretary, Ed McClellan, and approved. David Ripley called attention to the work of Ed Rutkowski on the *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society* and urged members to support his efforts.

David Ripley presented the report of the nomination committee. Gerald Gutek moved that the report be accepted and the nominees be elected unanimously. The motion carried. The following were elected: Rosemary V. Donatelli, President; Edward McClellan, Vice-President; and Peter DeBoer, Secretary.

Ed McClellan moved that the Society express its appreciation to Loyola University for hosting the meeting and to Rosemary Donatelli both for making arrangements for the meeting and for providing an excellent program. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The dates of October 29-30 were set for the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

B. Edward McClellan
Secretary

MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Directory of Attendance 1975

David Adams – Cleveland State University

Charles Alberti – Illinois Benedictine College

James Ansbro – Loyola University of Chicago

Zita J. Asay – Loyola University of Chicago

Robert E. Belding – University of Iowa

Thomas R. Berg – University of Northern Iowa

Ladtongbai Bhuapirom – Loyola University of Chicago

Rosemarie B. Bogal – Loyola University of Chicago

Stephen E. Bower – Indiana University

Robert V. Bullough – Ohio State University

Rev. D. J. Carmody – Loyola University of Chicago

Carole Chambers – Loyola University of Chicago

Peter Collins – Marquette University

John Craig – University of Chicago

Peter DeBoer – Calvin College

Edward Denys – Luther High School South, Chicago

Rosemary V. Donatelli – Loyola University of Chicago

Walter H. Drost – Wisconsin Lutheran College

H. B. Dunkel – University of Chicago

A. M. Dupuis – Marquette University

Wayne Elwart – Illinois Benedictine College

Carl H. Gross – Michigan State University

Gerald L. Gutek – Loyola University of Chicago

Brenda Jackson – Indiana University

Paul R. Klohr – Ohio State University

Frances Kung – Loyola University of Chicago

Patricia Kurriger – College of DuPage

Lyle J. Kurth – Concordia Teachers College

Wm. K.J. Lee – Loyola University of Chicago

Tim Leonard – St. Xavier College

Neil Lloyd – Loyola University of Chicago

Russell Marks – Indiana University

Robert E. Mason – Southern Illinois University

Robert L. McCaul – University of Chicago

B. Edward McClellan – Indiana University

Daniel McDougall – Loyola University of Chicago

James Merritt – Northern Illinois University

Steven I. Miller – Loyola University of Chicago

J. Geoffrey Moore – Michigan State University

Frank Nelsen – University of Wisconsin

Timothy Niggle – Indiana University

Rev. F. Thomas Okozuwa – Loyola University of Chicago

Asirvatham Periaswamy – Loyola University of Chicago

David P. Ripley – Northern Illinois University

Edward Rutkowski – University of Northern Iowa

Charles E. Samec – Morton West High School

H. C. Sherman – Northern Illinois University

Dennis W. Sinclair – University of Michigan

Kay Smith – Loyola University of Chicago

Sam R. Snyder – University of Toledo

W. Richard Stephens – Greenville College

Donald R. Warren – University of Illinois

Andrew Wawrzyniak – Loyola University of Chicago

Barry H. Westfall – Carthage College

Daphne Wise – Illinois Benedictine College

Jay Wissot – California State College--San Bernadino